

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

THE CHURCH OF ROME

1303.e 116



THE CHURCH OF ROME

THE CHURCH OF ROME

A STANDING TESTIMONY TO
THE TRUTH OF GOD'S
WORD

BY
REV. WILLIAM LOCKETT

Formerly Rector of Littledean

LONDON
CHAS. J. THYNNE
GREAT QUEEN STREET
KINGSWAY, W.C
1907.



INTRODUCTION.

What is the meaning of the woman seated on the scarlet-coloured beast having upon her forehead a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth?—Rev. xvii.

Before giving an answer to this question I would make a few remarks. The Book of the Revelation is strictly a Book of symbols and symbolical language. The language is always symbolical, except in explanation. Explanations must be taken literally, or they would be no explanations at all. In the next place, it must be remembered, that no symbol can perfectly represent the thing symbolised. It would be absurd, therefore, to insist upon a symbol being made to represent the thing symbolised in all points, or to reject it because it cannot be made to do so. The most perfect symbol, that I know of, is a circle symbolising eternity. It is like eternity in having neither beginning nor end. In this respect the symbol is perfect. But take it in another light, and it is most imperfect, for if you start from any one point and go either way, you will at length come again to the point from which you started. But it would be absurd to find fault with it because it had this imperfection. So the types of the Old Testament were perfect, each one for the object for which it was appointed. Thus

the lamb without spot or blemish could, in this respect, well represent the sinless perfection of our Lord. But take it in any other light it could be no representation at all. It might be far from being the most valuable lamb in the flock. So, in looking at the symbols of the Book of Revelation, we must not expect to find them such as defy criticism or objection. They are certainly intended to have a meaning. But because there are some things very difficult, and probably for some reason intended to be so, some regard the whole as so difficult that we need not try to understand them, and even reject what appears to be the plain meaning of some parts of the Book. But to reject what we can understand, because there are some things which we cannot understand, is not wise either in religion or science.

CONTENTS.

PART I. IDENTIFICATION OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Chap.		Page
I.	REV. XVII. - - - - -	1-24
	„ XI. - - - - -	25-29
II.	2 THESS. II., 1-10. - - - - -	30-41
III.	1 TIM. IV., 1-6. - - - - -	42-49

PART II. DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

Chap.		Page
I.	TRADITION - - - - -	50-54
II.	THE COMMANDMENTS - - - - -	55-77
III.	SUPEREROGATION - - - - -	78-79
IV.	SACRAMENTS, CONFIRMATION - - - - -	80-81
V.	MARRIAGE - - - - -	82
VI.	EXTREME UNCTION - - - - -	83
VII.	PENANCE - - - - -	84-94
VIII.	SIGNIFICATION OF REPENTANCE— <i>Μετάνοια</i> - - - - -	95-100
IX.	BAPTISM - - - - -	101-108
X.	HOLY ORDERS - - - - -	109-118
XI.	THE MASS - - - - -	119-127
XII.	TRANSUBSTANTIATION - - - - -	128-141
XIII.	PURGATORY - - - - -	142-157
XIV.	THE BIBLE AND ROMISH ACCOUNT OF MARY - - - - -	158-180

PART III.

	Page
THE CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME - - - - -	181-209

PART IV. WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?

Chap.		Page
I.	TRADITIONS - - - -	210
II.	HOW TRADITION SHOULD BE EXAMINED	211-212
III.	THE TRADITION OF IRENÆUS - -	212-215
IV.	" " OF TERTULLIAN -	215-216
V.	THE CHRONICLE OF EUSEBIUS - -	217
VI.	FURTHER CONDEMNATION OF THE TRA- DITION - - - -	218
VII.	APOSTOLICAL SUCCESSION DISCREDITED	219
VIII.	THE MOTHER OF ALL CHURCHES -	220-222
IX.	TRADITIONAL DEATH OF PETER AND PAUL	222-225
X.	NOT KNOWN IN ROME - - - -	225-226
XI.	THE LATTER YEARS OF ST. PAUL'S LIFE	227-229
XII.	THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY -	229-236
XIII.	EVIDENCE FROM EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS	237-240
XIV.	" FROM OTHER EPISTLES -	241-242
XV.	I PET. V., 13. - - - -	242-244
XVI.	CONCLUSION - - - -	245-246

PART V.

	Page
THE REAL FOUNDERS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME - -	247-256

PART VI. ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

Chap.		Page
I.	AGAINST THE PROTESTANT BIBLE •	257-271
II.	THE ORIGIN OF PROTESTANTISM •	272-275
III.	DISSOLUTION OF MONASTERIES - •	276-280

PART I.

IDENTIFICATION.

CHAPTER I.

THE description of the woman—Rev. xvii., 3-5. "I saw a woman sit on a scarlet-coloured beast full of the names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns—and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. THE EXPLANATION, verse 9: "Here is the mind that hath wisdom. The seven heads are seven mountains on which the woman sitteth," and in verse 18 we read: "The woman that thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." *Here, then, we have a clear and definite explanation.* Beyond all question Rome is here pointed out. The great city which then reigned over the kings of the earth was Rome, and none else; and Rome was built on seven hills, the Palatine, Capitoline, Aventine, Esquiline, Coelius, Quirinal, and Viminalis. The Romans delighted to speak of Rome as the city on seven hills, and that designation is often used to the present day. No other city was ever built on seven hills. But when a symbolical name

B

was required for that power which persecuted the saints, as the Babylonians destroyed Jerusalem, and Babylon was the place of the captivity of the Jewish Church, no name could be found so appropriate as Babylon, with the addition of "the great," because the old Babylon had sunk to a small decaying town, but it was not built on seven hills, but was situated in the midst of a great unbroken plain. The other peculiarity of the beast (namely, the ten horns) referred entirely to what was still future, namely, the kings who had not yet received their kingdoms.

ROMANISTS ALLOW THAT THE WOMAN ON THE SCARLET BEAST REPRESENTS ROME, but they say that it is pagan Rome. Protestants assert that it is the apostate Church of Rome. On which side does the evidence lie?—

1.—In the whole history of pagan Rome there is absolutely nothing which could be symbolised by a woman. The true symbol would be a man as in chapter vi. Pagan Rome was purely a military power, and the greatest military power the world had ever seen. *Could such be represented by a woman?*—On the other hand, in Scriptural symbolic language the Church is represented as a woman married unto the Lord. Jer. iii., 14: "Turn, O backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am married unto you." Isaiah liv., 5 and 6: "For thy maker is thy husband." So lxii., 4 and 5; Jer. xxxi., 32; Hos. ii., 19, etc. Consequently, when the Church was unfaithful to her Lord, her sin is characterised as the same as when "a wife deals treacherously with her husband" (Jer. iii., 20).

And the language used by prophets, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Hosea, is very strong and plain in this matter. In the New Testament also we find the same figurative language (2 Cor. xi., 2): "For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste virgin to Christ." See also Eph. v., 24-33, Rom. vii., 4. And in Rev. xxi., 9, the Church is called "the bride, the lamb's wife." Consequently, *an apostate Church would be most appropriately called a "harlot."* This clearly demonstrates that an apostate Church is meant: and therefore that Church is the Church of Rome.

2.—In the next place we are told that the woman made all nations drink of the golden cup of her abominations. See Rev. xvii., 2-4, and xviii., 3. She is therefore called the mother of harlots, because she made other Churches like herself. This cannot possibly refer to pagan Rome, for pagan Rome never attempted to force her religion on any of the nations that she conquered. Pagan Rome was purely a military power, which never interfered with the religion of any people. The Jews, for example, were not only allowed the full exercise of their religion in their own country, but even in Rome, where there was a large Jewish population, no attempts were ever made, either by force or persuasion, to induce them to adopt any other religion than their own. The same may be said of the ancient Britons, Gauls, Spaniards, Syrians, Egyptians and other conquered peoples. There is a passage in Cicero's defence of L Flaccus which illustrates this characteristic of pagan Rome. Speaking of the Jews, he called them "a suspicious

and scurrilous race." Their religion he said was "a barbarous superstition." Afterwards he said, "Each nation has its own religion, we have ours." From the whole passage it is evident that however hateful the religion of any people might be to pagan Rome, they would not persecute those who held it on account of their religion. They destroyed Jerusalem, but it was not on account of the Jews' religion, but on account of the constant insurrections against the Roman government, instigated by the many false Christs and false prophets foretold by our Lord (Matt. xxiv., 5 and 6). In like manner the persecution of Christians under the Empire was not for the purpose of propagating any religion. The first great persecution, according to the heathen historian Tacitus, was by the Emperor Nero, who, having set fire to Rome, by which a large part of the city was destroyed, in order to free himself from the odium, accused the Christians of having done it. The other persecutions arose from the fact that, when the number of Christians increased so that the heathen temples began to be deserted, opposition naturally arose, and some emperors joined the opposition and persecuted Christians. Such persecutions, therefore, may be regarded as exceptional. But a nation cannot be characterised by that which is exceptional. The Roman Empire was essentially a military power, and, so long as the conquered nations remained in subjection, it never interfered with their religion, or manners, or customs; so that *in no sense could it be said that pagan Rome made all nations drink of the cup of her fornication*—but of the apostate Roman Church the very

opposite is true. She absolutely took away the right of private judgment, and required all men to accept every single article of her adopted creed. So that *nothing could be more accurate than the words, "The inhabitants of the earth have been made drunk with the wine of her fornication."*

3.—The above leads to the consideration of the sentence, "I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus" (verse 6). Many historians believe that the persecutions by pagan Rome have been greatly exaggerated; but, taking them in their most exaggerated form without in the least trying to minimise them, they were exceedingly mild, compared with the bitterness with which the Church of Rome persecuted all who dared to question her teaching. The persecution of Diocletian is generally regarded as most severe. Yet of it Niebuhr, one of the greatest authorities in Roman History, says, "Dodwell is right in observing that it was hardly a shadow of what Alba did in the Netherlands." Every country in which she has had power has had its multitude of victims.

I would only mention two examples. First, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's Eve. Everything had been done to foster a feeling of security in the minds of Protestants, while all preparations were carefully made for their destruction. At the tolling of a bell on St. Bartholomew's Eve the massacre began, and from forty thousand to sixty thousand were murdered. When the news arrived in Rome, where it was eagerly expected, the Pope, "*drunk with the blood of his victims*," cried, "Good news,

good news." Medals were struck to commemorate the event, bearing on one side the likeness of the Pope, and on the reverse an angel holding in one hand the cross, and in the other a sword, with which he was slaying the Protestants, with the legend, "Hugonotorum strages," "the slaughter of the Hugonots," or Protestants. The other example I would name is what is euphemistically called "The Holy! Inquisition." When anyone, male or female, was suspected of being what the Church of Rome called a heretic, he was seized in the night and committed to the prison of Inquisition. When brought before the Inquisitors, he was subjected to the most frightful tortures to extort from him a confession of his guilt, and to compel him to give the names of others guilty of heresy. Then the poor victim ended his life either in the damp, filthy dungeons of the Inquisition, or at the stake, which might be considered a merciful ending. The confessions, extorted by hypocrisy, lying and deceit, or by torture, often became the ruin of many others. But there is one feature of the Holy! Inquisition yet to be noticed. The laws of pagan Rome required that the accused should have his accusers face to face, and have liberty to answer for himself (Acts xxv., 16). But in the Inquisition the accused was not allowed to know who his accusers were, *nor even the nature of the accusation*. If the accused, with the idea that, if he confessed that he had held heretical opinions, he would be more leniently dealt with, he was most grievously mistaken. He was told that he had not confessed all, and so he was tortured to extract more from

him. He was also required to give the names of others, and often through inconceivable suffering the poor victim was compelled to name others, who held the same heretical doctrines; and these, without knowing how, or what charge was brought against them, were subjected to the same infernal treatment. Surely **HEATHENISM NEVER PRODUCED OR DREAMED OF SUCH A DIABOLICAL INSTITUTION!** How many thousands perished through the unholy Inquisition! The apostate Church of Rome has murdered millions of Christians for no other crime than refusing to accept what they could not regard but as unscriptural and blasphemous teaching. Blasphemous teaching may seem a very harsh expression, but the woman seated on the seven-headed beast had a cup full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication (Rev. xvii., 4). And the beast that carried her, and which is identified with her, is described as "full of the names of blasphemy," that is, blasphemous teaching, and that, not on one subject only, but on many, yea, **UPON EVERY CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE**, as will be clearly shown. The cup was full.

4.—When Protestants at the time of the Reformation applied Rev. xvii. to the Church of Rome, Bossnet and Bellarmine found it necessary to attempt to turn aside the evidence. They freely admitted that it referred to Rome, but it was to Rome pagan, and they maintained that the prophecy of the fall of this mystical Babylon was fulfilled in the destruction of Rome by the Goths under Alaric, A.D. 410. But the attempt to fix the prophecy on pagan Rome, when compared with the passage in

Revelation, carries with it its own refutation. As before pointed out, the symbol of a woman drunk with the blood of the saints signifies an ecclesiastical, and not a civil or military, power, and therefore cannot signify pagan Rome. Moreover, when St. John saw it he was filled with astonishment; he could not have been so astonished at pagan Rome persecuting the saints; even his own personal experience in the Isle of Patmos would have prevented such astonishment. But it was a great and real cause of astonishment that the Church could have become the persecutor.

5.—Next the destruction of pagan Rome, A.D. 410, does not bear the least resemblance to the predicted destruction of the mystical Babylon. In verse 12 we are told that "the ten horns (ten is most probably symbolically a definite for an indefinite number, ten more or less, of which use there are many examples in Scripture) are ten kings, which have received no kingdom as yet, but receive power as kings one hour (that is for a short time) with the beast." Now there never was a time when any number of kings reigned with pagan Rome; and never did any kings voluntarily give their power and strength to pagan Rome. But pagan Rome gained her power solely by the sword. But there was a time, after the fall of the Empire, when a number of kingdoms were contemporaneous with the Church of Rome, which were gradually persuaded to accept all her doctrines, and thus gave their power unto her. When the Roman Empire was broken up a number of independent kingdoms were formed. Among these continual

changes have been made, so that any definite enumeration would be impossible, but they might well be symbolically said to be ten. We are also told that these ten horns, or kingdoms, will ultimately hate her and destroy her. But the destruction of pagan Rome by Alaric was not by any number of kings, who had first reigned with her, and then given their power and strength to her, but it was by a barbarous people, who came from a distant and almost unknown country. This, again, is another proof that pagan Rome was not the mystical Babylon.

6.—The same chapter gives us still further evidence. We are told the seven heads not only symbolised seven hills, but are also made to represent seven kings. The seven hills and the seven kings must be connected together. But the seven kings cannot be taken to mean seven Roman Emperors, for it would be absurd to say there were seven, when, in fact, there were more than seventy. Kings are symbolical for kinds of government. We are told that five had fallen (verse 10), one was in existence when St. John wrote, the seventh was still future. The five which had fallen were Kings, Consuls, Dictators, Decemvirs and Tribunes. These different forms of government, with various modifications, had existed in Rome. But as the Book of Revelation dealt only with the future, and as a double interpretation was required for the seven heads, after mentioning the five fallen, the attention is directed *only to the one then in existence and to that which was to follow*. Now that which was in existence was the government of the Emperor.

This was the sixth. What was the seventh? It was that which was established by Diocletian. He made a complete change in the government, it may be called a complete revolution, only the name "Emperor" was retained which concealed the change. See Niebuhr's lectures on the history of Rome. Lecture cxxix. Gibbon also in his "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" dwells at considerable length on the change.* Here, then, we have the seventh government. But the most remarkable part of the prophecy is that an eighth comes in as if by stealth. There are seven—why was it not said there were eight? This, surely, marks something peculiar about the eighth. Now let us consider what is peculiar about the eighth, which comes in in such a singular method. First he is of the seven, not really one of the seven, or he would not be the eighth. But he is in some way like them, pagan and idolatrous. The Greek *ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ* signifies that it derived its origin and character from the pagan powers, which had passed away. In fact, the eighth is (verse 11) none other than the beast "which was and is not," declared to be the same as described in verses 3-8, the beast that carried the great whore. But it will be observed that this beast with seven heads and ten horns, "which was and is not," being the eighth head did not come into existence till the seventh or last of pagan Rome heads passed away (pages 31 and 32). This signifies that no notice need be taken of the seven pagan govern-

* He says, "Diocletian assumed the diadem and introduced a new ceremonial; this was a new form of government." Again, "Diocletian may be called the founder of a new empire."

ments beyond the fact that their extinction marks the time of the rise of the eighth *as an independent power*, for nothing either bad or good is said about the seven pagan governments. But the beast with seven heads and ten horns, now shown to be the eighth head, was the power which persecuted and made war with the saints, and overcame them (xiii., 1-7), and so was drunk with their blood. The beast and the woman, who sat upon it, form in reality but one symbol, though the different parts point to different significations, as the heads and horns of the same beast have different interpretations.

7.—There is also another point well worthy of notice. I believe that no one could possibly read the description of the beast with any thought or attention without being struck with the remarkable description in verse 8. "The beast was and is not, and shall ascend out of the abyss, and go to perdition": and, again, "The beast that was, and is not, and shall be present," *παύσεται*; and verse 11: "The beast that was, and is not, and shall go to perdition." These different descriptions of the beast are given as if they were exactly the same, yet each change in the expression is evidently designed. There must be a reason for this. Does it not most clearly show that the description has a symbolical meaning? To take the sentences literally would be impossible. What, then, is the symbolical meaning? In no part of the Bible, except in the Book of Revelation (i., 4 and 8, xi., 17), is God, or our Lord Jesus Christ, described as "He who was, who is, and who is to come," though the meaning is the same as Heb. xiii., 8, "Jesus Christ

is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," signifying His eternal unchangeable nature. Does it not seem, therefore, certain that what is said of the seven-headed beast is a parody of the words, "He who was, and who is, and who is to come"? We have seen abundant reason for concluding that this chapter (Rev. xvii.) refers to an apostate Church, and here that apostate Church is clearly pointed out to be the Church of Rome. The Pope pretends to be the Vicar or representative of Christ on earth; the symbolical language signifies that the pretence is an imposture, that he is only a representative of Christ as far as "that was, and that is not, and that shall ascend out of the abyss, and go to perdition" represents Him "who was, and who is, and who shall be." And does not the change in the expression point to the perpetual change in the Church of Rome (see page 19), though professing to be unchangeable?

8.—Further, the beast is described as "the scarlet beast." This, too, doubtless, has a symbolical meaning, but, if so, that meaning must in some way point in the same direction as the other symbols. Now scarlet is especially the cardinal colour. The cardinals are the princes of the Church of Rome, the electors and counsellors of the Pope; and each cardinal on his investiture receives the scarlet hat. Surely, this taken with the other symbols is something more than a mere coincidence; it must be a definite prediction.

9.—But there is another mark of the beast which is given by the author of the Apocalypse, xiii., 18. The number of its name is said to be 666. The

Greeks had no numerals, but each letter of the alphabet represented a number, and sometimes a name, or a sentence, was said to contain a number, that is, the value of the letters contained in it amounted to that number. It is frequently said that it is absurd to attach any importance to the number 666, because 666 can be made to fit many different things. But when this objection is examined it will be found to be of no weight. For example, if the police were looking out for a man who, amongst other marks, was said to stand exactly six feet, would they consider it absurd to take notice of the man's stature because many men might be found of the same stature? Certainly not. They would consider it a very definite and important limit, as it would exclude everyone who was either under or over that height. So 666 sets a definite limit. In seeking the meaning, it must necessarily be in the Greek language, because the book is written in Greek, and it refers to what was a purely Greek custom. It would be absurd to seek it in any other language, as some have sought it in English. Further, in assigning a meaning to 666, that meaning must of necessity agree with the other marks of the beast. Within these reasonable and necessary limitations it would not be easy to find many interpretations of the number. Nay, I believe it would not be possible to find a single one except the right one. If anyone thinks otherwise let him try to find an example.

The early Christians could never dream of the Church becoming the persecutor. But they evidently looked to Rome as the seat of the persecuting

power; chapter xvii. definitely settled that point. Irenæus gave *λάτεινος* (Lateinos, the Latin man) as the interpretation of the number, and this was almost universally accepted, and is still accepted by many. But Bellarmine pointed out that this could not be correct, since the word Latin was wrongly spelt, ei being put for i. This, of course, was fatal, for we have no right to add, or take away, or change a single letter. But the early Church certainly looked in the right direction for the interpretation, for if we take "the Latin Kingdom" we have exactly the right number, *ἡ λατίνη βασιλεια*, *ἡ* 8, *λ* 30, *α* 1, *τ* 300, *ι* 10, *ν* 50, *η* 8, *β* 2, *σ* 1, *σ* 200, *ι* 10, *λ* 30, *ε* 5, *ι* 10, *α* 1. These numbers added together make 666. This interpretation is found in Adam Clarke's Commentary.

But it might be asked why the word kingdom is used? Because the beast with seven heads and ten horns, which so mysteriously came into existence on the extinction of the seven pagan powers, is rightly called by the same name, for he was "of the seven" which had passed away: and as they were called kings or kingdoms, so ought this eighth to be called a kingdom. And it is distinctly so called in xvi., 10, and to the present day the Pope claims to be a king, and in Italy he is called "Il Papa Re," "The Pope King," so that no expression could be more exact for the Church of Rome than the Greek for "the Latin Kingdom." Her prayers are in Latin, the decrees of her councils are in Latin: she blesses in Latin, and curses in Latin: she even makes the Latin translation of the Scriptures her standard

instead of the language of the Apostles and Prophets, and is frequently called "the *Latin Church*."

Since writing the above I have observed, what I had often noticed before, that in Greek MSS. *i* and *ei* are often interchanged, some using the one and some the other, but it never occurred to me till now to apply this fact to the present case. Thus, in "The Resultant Greek Testament," by Weymouth, the various readings are given at the bottom of each page. The change between *i* and *ei* is constantly met with. Thus, page 507, in Coloss. ii., 18, to iii., 5, there are no less than five such cases. Again, Tischendorf in the Tauchnitz edition of the English New Testament gives a facsimile of the writings of the three oldest known MSS. of the Greek Testament. In the oldest, the Sinaitic (Matt. x., 18), where all printed editions give βασιλείς we find βασιλις. So the names in Latin, Alexandria, Antiochia, Samaria, etc., in Greek are written Alexandreia, Antiocheia, Samareia, etc. Now, if *i* and *ei* are so often interchanged by the Greeks, is there any valid reason why the *i* in Latinus should not be changed into *ei* in Greek? This gives λάτρευος the Latin man, λ 30, α 1, τ 300, ε 5, ι 10, υ 50, ο 70, ς 200=666. As a matter of fact, Irenæus and the Christian writers, who lived near the time of the Apostles, and who wrote in the Greek language, thought it a correct way of spelling the word, and their successors, who wrote in Greek, accepted it as correct. And surely their opinion is far more likely to be right than Bellarmine's, who apparently thought that the Greeks would confine

themselves to the Roman method of spelling the word. But, doubtless, the true reason of his objection to "Lateinos" was because it confirmed the evidence against the Church of Rome. But if anything else were needful to extinguish Bellarmine's objection to Lateinos, it is furnished by the Greek method of spelling the name of Pilate. In Latin it is Pilatus; but according to the "Resultant Greek Testament" (which means the result arrived at by a comparison of all the known ancient Greek MSS. by the universally recognised authorities), the most accepted way of spelling the word in Greek is Peilatus, Πειλάτος.

The double interpretation of 666 is certainly very remarkable. There are two recognised methods of spelling "Latin" in Greek, yet in each case the solution points definitely to the Church of Rome, and this very greatly strengthens the importance of the remark that I before made, that I believe it would be impossible to find any other solution of the number 666 to agree with the other marks of the beast except the correct one. Of each of these two solutions we may say alike "it is the right one."

11.—The title before mentioned, "Il Papa Re," is a double departure from Christ's teaching. Papa, or Pope, means "Father." Now the command of our Lord is (Matt. xxiii., 9), "Call no man your father upon the earth." If the name Pope is not a violation of that command, I know not what would be, and the violation is emphasised by calling him the "Holy Father." And in verse 8 He forbids even such honour being paid to any man, as teacher, as the Jews paid to their Rabbeis. But the Church

of Rome goes far beyond that. And in verse 10 He forbids anyone allowing himself to be called *καθηγητής* a guide claiming authority, since He Himself is the only *καθηγητής*. It would scarcely be possible to condemn the claims of the Pope more definitely than these words of our Lord. If it be said that the term "Father" is applied to every priest, that only makes the matter worse, for it will be shown that the use of the word "priest" is contrary to God's word, and applying to them the title "Father" only shows the extent to which Christ's command has been set aside. And the Pope is the head of the transgressors as the "Supreme Father."

12.—"Il Papa Re." Until A.D. 1870 the Pope was a King, like other earthly kings. His temporal kingdom was then taken away, and his dominion given to the King of Italy. But the Pope still claims the kingdom as his right, and regards the King of Italy as an Usurper, and pretends that he cannot rightly exercise his papal functions whilst deprived of his temporal power; and he has lately given to the world an illustration of his feelings in this matter. The King of England was so ill-advised as to pay a visit to the Pope. But the Pope would not see him, if he came direct from the "Usurper's" Palace, or direct from the British Embassy, for that is an Embassy to the King of Italy. So the King went through what appears to be the ridiculous farce of pretending not to be the guest of the King of Italy by going to the Pope in another way. Now Jesus said, "My kingdom is not of this world." Yet the Pope, who pretends to be the Vicar of Christ, His representative, pretends

c

that he cannot properly perform his vicarious duties unless he has a kingdom purely of this world. Surely this is an absurdity? But it is also contempt of God's word.

13.—We may observe as another mark of identification, that “the great whore” is described as “arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand.” This is evidently symbolical of great wealth and costly display, and is a true picture of the Church of Rome. The wealth of the Church of Rome in her cathedrals and churches, in “gold and precious stones and pearls,” in splendid and costly vestments, etc., is beyond calculation (see also pages 74 and 75). And St. Bernard in the early part of the 12th century said that the Pope then appeared to be more like the successor of the Emperor Constantine than of the poor fisherman Peter. And coming to recent times, when the Pope was seen “setting forth arrayed in gold and precious stones in his newly gilded state-carriage, five footmen in lace-adorned liveries standing on it behind (for the carriages of the cardinals have only three of these), drawn by six magnificent steeds with purple trappings, and surrounded by his brilliant noble-guard, who compelled all male occupants of carriages coming along to dismount”—this suggests that the thought that neither Constantine nor any other emperor could be compared with the Pope. The apostate Church of Rome surpassed in magnificence pagan or imperial Rome.

14.—Another mark worthy of particular attention is the name “Mystery” upon the head of “the

great whore.” Can that name be applied in any possible way to pagan Rome? There was nothing mysterious, or needing revelation, in the way pagan Rome gained her great power; nor was there anything mysterious in the way that that power was exercised. These things were matters of history, open and manifest to the understanding of everybody. Nor was there anything mysterious in the religion of pagan Rome more than in the religion of any other pagans. The name Mystery cannot in any way be applied to pagan Rome. Therefore “the great whore” cannot in any sense signify pagan Rome.

But when we turn to the Church of Rome all is changed. It is Mystery, Mystery everywhere. THE CHURCH CAN ONLY BE RIGHTLY JUDGED BY WHAT SHE WAS WHEN SHE HAD FULL POWER (2 Thess. ii., 7).

(a).—Is it not a mystery that any man can believe that the Church of Rome is unchangeable when, in fact, it has been perpetually undergoing change by adding, not only new rites and ceremonies, but new articles of faith? The last two added were the Immaculate Conception, A.D. 1854, and the Infallibility of the Pope, A.D. 1870.

(b).—Is it not a mystery that, whilst Jesus rebuked James and John for their hasty expression about calling down fire from Heaven upon Samaritans, who were unwilling to receive Him, saying, “Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men’s lives, but to save them” (Luke ix., 52-56), a Church, which professes to obey and follow His example, could deliberately murder multitudes, who received

and loved Him, because they could not accept doctrines which they believed were unscriptural and dishonouring to Jesus?

(c).—Is it not a mystery how, when Jesus continually referred to the Scriptures, and bids us to search the Scriptures, and said that the Pharisees rendered the word of God of none effect by their traditions (*what about Romish traditions?*), and also said that the errors of the Sadducees arose from their ignorance of the Scriptures, the Church could, under the severest penalties, forbid the people to read the Scriptures in a language that they can understand, or even to possess a copy? See Part VI.

(d).—Is it not a mystery how a man, professing to be the Vicar or representative of Christ, who laid aside His glory, and humbled Himself to take upon Himself human nature, could reverse the order, and exalt himself or allow others to exalt him into a God? Thus, in the Lateran Council, Marcellas addressed the Pope, "Thou art another God on earth." And on the coronation of Pope Innocent X., Cardinal Colonna, in his own name, and in the name of the clergy of St. Peter's, thus kneeling addressed the Pope: "Most holy and blessed father, ruler of the world, to whom the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are committed, whom the angels in Heaven revere, and the gates of hell fear, and all the world adores, we especially venerate, worship and adore thee." Such language is not used now. The Reformation robbed the Pope of much of his glory. Still, the coronation of Pope Pius X. was an imposing ceremony. But when the choir sang

"Tu es Petrus," it suggested a contrast between St. Peter, who said to Cornelius, "Stand up, I myself also am a man," and the man who allowed Cardinals, Bishops, and Abbots to bow down and kiss his feet. And when they sang, "*Ecce sacerdos magnus*," they gave him a title which, according to the Epistle to the Hebrews (see Heb. iv., 14, vii., 24), belongs to Christ alone. So Pius X. inherits from Pius IX. *the divine attribute of infallibility!*

(e).—And is not the whole priesthood a mystery? By the fifth canon of the seventh session of the Council of Trent it is declared that the intention of the officiating priest to perform a sacrament is necessary. Now, who can tell what a man's intentions are? Even Bellarmine, the greatest of Roman controversialists, confessed, "None can be certain, by the certainty of faith, that he receives a true sacrament, since no one can see the intentions of another." And, again, he says, "If we consider in Bishops their power of ordination, we have no more than a moral certainty that they are true Bishops." Hence, no man can have any certainty that he has been baptised, and if he has not been baptised he cannot be saved, according to the teaching of the Church of Rome. A poor prospect for all its members!

But even what Bellarmine calls "moral certainty" entirely vanishes when we come to examine it. Even Romish writers tell us that for more than six hundred years before the Reformation most of the Bishops and priests were exceeding corrupt and immoral, we may therefore conclude that most of them were infidels and hypocrites. Take one of the

Bishops of that early time, who through the hypocrisy of a bad priest was not baptised because the priest had no intention of celebrating a sacrament. In his heart he laughed at it, or was all the time thinking of something else. Now that Bishop, according to the Church's teaching, could be no Bishop at all. Yet he would year by year go through the form of ordaining priests, but being no Bishop these would only be sham priests. Yet they would go to many parishes, and in not one of these parishes could there be any sacrament. All the children would grow up unbaptised, and live without any sacrament, because a sham priest could not perform the sacrament. And many supposed to have been baptised would become sham priests and sham Bishops. And these again would go on multiplying so-called priests. In each generation the circle would rapidly increase, for it must be remembered that the chain once broken could never be mended. And it must be remembered that the evil would spread in what mathematicians call geometrical ratio. Who can tell how far the mischief would spread during the thousand years that have elapsed *through that one single bad priest?* But, doubtless, there were MANY SUCH. But let us come to facts. According to the teaching of the Church of Rome, a Bishop guilty of bribery or simony is incapable of performing the functions of a Bishop. Now, if there be any truth in history, *many Bishops and Popes obtained their appointments by bribery or something worse.* See the testimony of Baronius, the late Pope's faithful witness (page 70). Yet all these were recognised as

Bishops, A.D. 912. Each one of these continued to send forth men as priests, though they had no power to make them priests. And under this multitude of so-called priests the rising generation would grow up unbaptised and without any sacrament, and incapable of becoming priests. Yet out of these the future Bishops and priests were taken. And this ever widening circle has been going on for at least a thousand years, IF, INDEED, IT HAS NOT LONG AGO PASSED THE POSSIBILITY OF WIDENING. So that if the question be asked, "Where are the priests?" the answer is "MYSTERY." There are thousands of so-called priests, but the Church could not prove that there is a single priest among them. Even the Pope could not know whether he was ever baptised, confirmed, ordained, or consecrated; for how could he know anything about the intentions of those who officiated? But supposing their intentions were good, how could it be known that they had not, through some fault many generations back, been rendered incapable of becoming priests? So THE POPE, AFTER ALL, ACCORDING TO THE DOCTRINE OF HIS OWN CHURCH, may be, and almost certainly is ONLY A LAYMAN. There is scarcely the possibility of his being anything else. And if there be no priest there is no sacrament. Therefore, in St. Paul's words (Acts xvii., 23), one may say to all Romanists, "That which ye ignorantly worship, this I declare unto you," is only a little flour and water. For the history of the word Priest see pages 109-113.

(f).—But the greatest mystery of all is Rome's power of misleading (2 Thess. ii., 10): "WITH ALL

DECEIVABLENESS of unrighteousness." See page 19. Notwithstanding the multitude of her contradictions and perversions of God's word, her many self-contradictions and self-condemnations, she is able to induce men to renounce their private judgment, their reason, and the testimony of their senses, to be led blindfold in matters which most intimately affect their everlasting condition. Rev. xiii., 3: "All the world wondered after the beast." Or, as it is well expressed in the Romish version, "ALL THE EARTH WAS IN ADMIRATION AFTER THE BEAST," following after in blind admiration.

14.—The identification of the Church of Rome is still further confirmed by the Book of Revelation. We have seen how the woman on the scarlet-coloured beast definitely pointed out the corrupt Church of Rome by a number of unmistakable marks. Now, in chapter xii., we have a woman clothed with the sun and moon under her feet. This is symbolical of the true Church clothed with light and purity. But this Church was persecuted (verse 3) by "a great red dragon with seven heads and ten horns," the scarlet-coloured, seven-headed, ten-horned beast which carried the great whore (xvii., 3). But to this true Church (verse 14) "were given two wings of a great eagle that she might fly into the wilderness," which shows that it was in constant danger through the malice of the persecuting enemy. Yet history tells us that during those dark days of persecution there was never wanting a succession of brave men, who risked and laid down their lives for the truth in exposing the immoral corruption and unscriptural teaching of the dominant Church.

15.—In chapter xi. we have God's two witnesses. The reason why two only are mentioned will be seen by what is stated below. These are not two persons, the length of the time of their prophesying excludes that interpretation, but a succession of persons. They prophesied clothed in sackcloth, that is, in mourning. It was the time of persecution, the persecution of the pure Church. Of the two witnesses it is said (verses 5 and 6), "If any man will hurt them, fire proceedeth out of their mouth, and devoureth their enemies." This is exactly what was said of the word of God spoken by the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. v., 14): "Because ye speak this word, behold I will make my words in thy mouth fire, and this people wood, and it shall devour them." These were God's witnesses, sent of God to protest against the corruptions of the professing Church, but their enemies called them heretics, and continued to persecute them. The fourth Lateran Council (as others had done before) in 1215 decreed that all heretics should be extirpated, and this was done as far as possible with relentless persistence, and by the end of the 15th century appeared to have succeeded. So at the beginning of the 16th century, according to the unanimous testimony of historians, in the Church of Rome everything seemed quiet, no danger threatened, every heretic extirpated. Thus, in the great Council of the Lateran, assembled during the years 1512 to 1514, it was declared that the Waldenses were extinct, only the Bohemians remained. Therefore, in the eighth session of 1513 the Bohemians were summoned to attend the Council on May 5th, 1514.

On that day when the Bohemians had been called and no one responded, the orator of the Council ascended the pulpit and, amid the applause of the assembled Bishops, said, "Jam nemo reclamatur, nullus obstat," "No one protests, no one opposes." So it was declared that heresy was extinct. It had been decreed that heretics should not have Christian burial. So we are told (verse 9) that "they of the people, kindreds, languages, and nations (that is, the Bishops assembled out of nations subject to the Pope) shall see their dead bodies three days and a half, and shall not suffer their dead bodies to be put in graves. And they that dwell on the earth shall rejoice over them, and make merry, and send gifts one to another; because these two prophets (preachers) tormented them that dwell on the earth (as Jeremiah did, as quoted above). And after three days and a half the spirit of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet: and great fear fell upon them that saw them." Now, what were the three days and a half? They were three and a half prophetic days, that is, three years and a half, as the seventy weeks or four hundred and ninety days in the Book of Daniel signified four hundred and ninety years. On the 5th of May, 1514, the great Roman Catholic Council proclaimed the death of the two witnesses, and on October 31st, 1517 (between these two dates are exactly three years and a half), Martin Luther revived the witness against the Church of Rome by fixing his Thesis, or protest, upon the gate of the Church of Wittenberg—a protest which shook the Church of Rome to its very foundation. More-

over, the two faithful witnesses, the Bohemians and Waldenses, were not extinct. They had been thoroughly crushed and silenced. The Bohemians had been driven from their native land and scattered, but after some years they arrived in small detachments in Saxony, where they formed a Church called "The United Brethren," or Moravians, the most faithful missionary Church on earth. And the Waldenses, after the most terrible sufferings, their enemies sparing neither sex nor age, found shelter in their almost inaccessible mountains. And their descendants are now preaching the Gospel and witnessing in Rome itself, without the Pope's permission.

Now, let us see what the passage says about the enemy which made war against the two witnesses and overcame and killed them (verse 7). It is said to be "the beast that ascendeth out of the bottomless pit," that is, it is the same beast that carried the great whore (xvii., 8), shown to be the Church of Rome. This is confirmed by the fact that it is said that the members of the Council, after declaring that the two witnesses were dead, saw their dead bodies in the *street of the great city* (see xvii., 18). Next, it is said that that city, which according to the context meant the Roman Catholic Church, was spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, two most appropriate names. That it truly deserved to be called Sodom is sufficiently testified by members of the Church (see pages 69-71). Nor is the name Egypt less appropriate. Egypt was the place of bondage to the Israelites. What bondage could be more humiliating, more opposed to reason, than that which the

Church of Rome imposes on all who are under her power to be denied the right of exercising their private judgment in those things which concern their eternal interest. Cardinal Wiseman exactly expressed the sentiments of his Church when he wrote: "If what your senses say is white, the Church decrees it to be black, or if that which your senses say is black, the Church says that it is white, you must reject the evidence of your senses and believe the Church." He might have added, if you don't do so, you are a heretic. Surely this describes a terrible yoke of bondage. When the Church of Rome decreed that heretics should be exterminated, what was the crime for which they suffered? It was simply that they dared to hold opinions which differed from the teaching of that Church. And if the Church had still the same power, her actions would still be the same, for her teaching on the subject is the same (pages 65-68 and 264 and 265). She has never revoked those decrees, nor expressed a word of regret for the numberless murders of those whom she calls heretics.

Again, in the same verse 8, after it is said that the city (symbolical for Church) is spiritually called Sodom and Egypt, it is added, "where also our Lord was crucified." Our Lord was crucified just outside Jerusalem, but it is evident that that is not meant. The expression is symbolical. It was on the cross that Jesus made an atonement for all sin. And nothing could be more definitely stated than the fact that that atonement was full and complete, and could never be repeated (Heb. ix., 26 and 28; x., 12-14; 1 Peter iii., 18). But as the Church of

Rome pretends to offer the body and blood of Christ in the mass as a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, and ACTUALLY CALLS IT THE SAME SACRIFICE AS THAT OFFERED ON THE CROSS, nothing could be more accurate *symbolically* than to say, that our Lord is crucified in the Church of Rome. Here, again, we have the Church of Rome identified as "the beast that ascended out of the abyss or bottomless pit, that made war against the two witnesses, and overcame them and killed them" (verse 7). Compare xiii., 1, 6, and 7, with xvii., 3. In every case it is the same seven-headed beast full of the names of blasphemy that persecuted and killed the saints.

CHAPTER II.

THE foregoing interpretation of Rev. xvii. has a remarkable confirmation in 2 Thess. ii. Read the chapter carefully. St. Paul thought it possible, or even probable, that the coming of our Lord would be in his time. He had spoken strongly of this return to the Thessalonians, and also in his first Epistle to them (1 Thess. iv., 15) he had used the words, "We which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord." Therefore the Thessalonians had concluded that the return of our Lord would certainly be immediate. In his second Epistle St. Paul thought it necessary to correct this false impression, telling them not to be shaken in mind or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by what he had said when he was with them, nor by the letter that they had received from him, as "that the day of Christ was at hand." Then he distinctly stated that before Christ came there would be a falling away, and "the man of sin" would be revealed. Who or what is the man of sin? Whatever he may be, his origin is the same as that of the seven-headed scarlet beast. For of the latter it is said (Rev. xiii., 2), "The dragon (which is the old serpent called the devil and Satan which deceiveth the whole world, Rev. xii., 9) gave him his power and his seat and great authority." So also "the coming of the man

of sin is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness " (2 Thess. ii., 10). To turn aside this evidence Romanists say that this man of sin is some monster that is to arise just before the second coming of Christ. Can this be the meaning? Certainly not, for "the man of sin" was to be revealed as soon as something, which then existed, was taken out of the way. If, then, "the man of sin" has not already been revealed, it must be because the restraining power has not yet been taken away; therefore that power must still be in existence. But where is it? There is absolutely nothing in existence now that existed in St. Paul's time. Therefore "the man of sin" has already come, or the prediction has failed. And as the mystery of iniquity did already work in St. Paul's time, it must during more than 1,800 years have grown to *an enormous power*. Where is it? In the Church of Rome.

Next, observe with what caution the Apostle writes. "Remember ye not, that when I was with you, I was telling (that is more than once) you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth that he might be revealed in his time." But why this hesitation? Why this roundabout way of reminding them? How much easier it would have been to state plainly to what he was alluding. And what an advantage to those who never heard what he had said to them! But there was need of caution. It was the power of the Roman Emperor that was to be taken away that was meant. (The seventh head must be taken away

before the eighth could come.) He had mentioned it when speaking to them. But to have put it down in writing (which, or a copy of which, would no doubt fall into the hands of the enemy) that the Emperor must be taken away, that some exceedingly wicked and dangerous power might succeed him in the Church, would, beyond all question, have caused the Emperor to follow the example of Herod in his attempt to kill the infant Jesus. The whole power of the Empire would have been put forth against Christians, and the work of extermination would not have ceased so long as a single Christian was known to remain. The dangerous power was an ecclesiastical power, for the apostasy still continued in the Church, *sitting in the temple of God*—verse 4 (page 3). As St. Paul expected that the coming of Christ might be very soon, he must have thought that “the man of sin” would quickly be revealed. The mystery of iniquity did already work. False teaching is frequently mentioned in the Epistles. And the grasping of power and influence had already begun, some teachers “speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them.” No one can read the history of the Church with care without being struck with the continually increasing struggle for power in the Church. In this contest for power the importance of the City of Rome, the chief city in the world, gave the Bishops of Rome a great advantage over the rest, of which they did not fail (often by fraud, forged documents, decretals, and pretended apostolical constitutions) to make the most. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, A.D. 250, writing to the Bishop of Rome, said, that

"A precedence was given to the see of Rome, because Rome *for its greatness* ought to precede Carthage." Cyprian knew nothing of any power inherited by the Bishop of Rome from Peter. As the power of the Emperors declined, the power and influence of the Bishops of Rome increased. But that "wicked one" could not be revealed till the Emperors were taken out of the way. After that, the Pope slipped into the place of the Emperor, as we saw in Rev. xvii.; he was the eighth, and was "of the seven."

Innumerable examples of the contest for power in the Church might be given. I will give one notable example. When Constantine removed for a time the seat of government from Rome to Constantinople, the Bishop of Constantinople, regarding that as now the chief city in the world, assumed the title of Universal Bishop, that is, Bishop of the whole Christian Church. He knew nothing of any power of the Bishop of Rome derived from Peter. This title continued to be used till the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 587, at which Council, John, Bishop of Constantinople, was honoured with that title. When Palagius II., Bishop of Rome, received an account of the Council, he strongly protested against the title being given to John. Gregory the Great, who succeeded, A.D. 590, finding that John still used that title, laboured for some years to deprive the Bishops of Constantinople of the title, which in his letters he designated as "*profane, anti-Christian, and infernal by whomsoever used.*" It is very clear that Pope Gregory did not believe that Peter had transmitted any supremacy

to the Bishops of Rome, or he would never have used such language, but would have claimed the title to himself. This continued contention between the Bishops of Rome and Constantinople ultimately resulted in a complete separation between the Eastern and Western Churches. And the Bishops of Rome ASSUMED TO THEMSELVES THE "PROFANE, ANTI-CHRISTIAN, AND INFERNAL TITLE." Surely, this was one result of pride; and this pride led to other blasphemous assumptions. And this is the chief mark of "the man of sin," pride and self-exaltation. "*He exalteth himself above all that is called God or that is worshipped.*" That this is a true mark of the Church of Rome is manifest (see pages 20 and 21), and will be further manifested.

Here, however, we may observe that the prediction in 2 Thess. ii. does not refer to any one man, but as he who had to be taken out of the way, the Emperor, was not a single person, but a succession of persons (Emperors), so "the man of sin," who succeeded the Emperors, was not a single person, but represents a succession of persons. So in Rev. xvii., 11, the eighth head, which came in so mysteriously, and is the caricature of Him "who is, and who was, and who is to come" (Rev. i., 8), is none other than the seven-headed beast, which carried the woman drunk with the blood of the saints (xvii., 6 and 7), and is not a single person, but a succession of persons. But it may be remarked that the prophecy, in reality, is not to be confined to persons, since it has reference also to the laws, the authorised doctrines, principles and practices of the

Apostate Church of Rome. And therefore it includes all those who (though professedly belonging to another Church) in heart sympathise with the Church of Rome, the secret societies which are labouring to bring back the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. **THEY HAVE THE MARK OF THE BEAST** (Rev. xiii., 16). And as among the Roman Emperors there were men of very different characters, some even professed to be Christians, so it has been among their successors, the Popes. Some have been such monsters of iniquity and impurity as could scarcely be found among the heathen. Others have been, as in the case of the present Pope, men, *humanly speaking*, of blameless lives. But, whatever the Pope may be, the Church of Rome remains the same, as it never goes back or renounces an error, and claims to be unchangeable.

The Pope is *the nominal head* of the Church; but, as is commonly said, there is a power behind the Pope which makes him in the language of Rev. xiii., 14 and 15, "the image of the beast," the representative of the Apostate Church. I will add that there are many good Christians in the Church of Rome, but they are such, not because they are in the Church of Rome, but by the grace of God they are such in spite of being in the Church of Rome. And the Book of Revelation recognises this fact; but, at the same time, declares *that it is not their proper place*; and therefore they are exhorted (Rev. xviii., 4): "Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." In the Church of Rome they are in danger. If they refuse to listen

to the truth, God may send them strong delusion to believe a lie, and perish (2 Thess. ii., 11 and 12).

The circumstance of the Pope, above alluded to, is remarkable. Rev. xiii., after saying that the seven-headed beast received a deadly wound, but the deadly wound was healed (which was exactly what occurred at the Reformation, when it seemed as if the power of Rome would for ever be broken, till the Inquisition, and especially the rise of the Jesuits, to a great extent restored it to power), goes on to say (verses 11-15): "I beheld another beast coming up out of the earth, and he had two horns like a lamb, and he spake as a dragon, and he exerciseth all the power of the first beast before him, and causeth the earth, and them that dwell therein, to worship the first beast, whose deadly wound was healed saying, that they should make an image of the beast that had the wound and did live. And he had power to give life unto the image of the beast, that the image of the beast should both speak, etc." This exactly describes the power of the Jesuits, as exactly as it could be described by symbolical language. The two horns well represent the double character of Jesuitism. It first appears under the cloak of religion, but it is far more a political organisation for reducing the world to subjection. Under its religious character it insinuates itself as a harmless lamb, even taking its name from "the Lamb of God," "The Society of Jesus," but afterwards proves to be a very dragon. Lord Acton, one of the most learned of Roman Catholic historians, writing about the political machinations of the Court of Rome in "Quirinus," page 369,

says of the order of the Jesuits: "It possesses, so to speak, an itinerant mint in its carefully elaborated skill in the direction of female souls, whether lodged in male or female bodies. They are thorough adepts, too, in the speculations of the money market, and manage their transactions in bank notes as successfully as the most practised merchant."

It has also been before well described as "a huge financial and political organisation." The Jesuits have been banished from every country of Europe as being DANGEROUS TO SOCIETY, but by their secret influence HAVE ALWAYS MANAGED TO RETURN. Even Pope Clement XIV., in his famous bull, "Dominus et Redemptor noster," suppressed "for ever the Society of Jesus." But "for ever" did not last long. At the present time they may be said to have suppressed the Pope. Thus, the Rev. Alex. Robertson, D.D., who has spent many years in Italy, in a work entitled "The Roman Catholic Religion in Italy," a copy of which has been accepted by the King of Italy, says: "The position of the Pope, Leo XIII., in the Church to-day is simply that of a slave of the Jesuits. This is so universally recognised in Italy that, when he says or does something outrageously disloyal, the Italian press, as a whole, regards him rather in pity than in anger, reserving its indignation for the Jesuits, saying, "Poor creature! he has to do as he is bid!" The general of the Jesuits, the Black Pope, is the real and only Pope, and so the image of the beast is made to speak, as in Rev. xiii., 15. So the prediction of Rev. xiii. is fulfilled. The Papacy, the scarlet seven-headed beast, continues unchanged, but all its powers are exercised

in its name by the more subtle two-horned lamb-like dragon, which has its secret emissaries in every part of the world, as well as its acknowledged members. No doubt many Jesuits are good, conscientious men, according to the Jesuit standard, that is, they speak and act according to their conscience; but as, to use Cardinal Newman's words, their conscience has had a twist, they are bound to render unquestioned obedience to their superior, and as that obedience is regarded as the highest virtue, they are simply tools in the hands of their superior—**IMPLICIT OBEDIENCE TO MAN INSTEAD OF TO GOD!** (Matt. vi., 24).

Another feature of "the man of sin" is (2 Thess. ii., 9) that of his "coming after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders." Lying wonders abound in the Church of Rome. There were plenty of them in this country before the Reformation, but the Reformation swept them all away, and they are now but vaguely remembered, except that the records of a few remain. But in Spain and other Catholic countries they still abound. As an example, take "the Holy House of Loretto." This is said to be the house in which Joseph, Mary, and Jesus lived in Nazareth. When the Crusaders left Palestine, this house, to avoid being polluted by the infidels, took flight to Fiume, in Dalmatia, A.D. 1291, where it remained three years; then it removed to Reconati, and finally to its present abode. It is now enclosed in a magnificent building. Indulgences were attached to pilgrimages and prayers offered at the shrine by the Popes Julius II., Sextus V., and Innocent

XII., and its treasury of votive offerings is one of the richest in the world. Is not this a case of lying wonders? Some Roman Catholics are ashamed of it, and say that no one is bound to believe it, because it is not an article of faith. That may be so, but it stands, in this respect, exactly on the same level as the doctrine of "Papal Infallibility" and "The Immaculate Conception" before the pontificate of Pius IX. And not only has the Church never spoken a word against the monstrous imposture, but the Church not only has in time passed encouraged, but still encourages pilgrimages to the "Santa Casa," and receives the offerings of the pilgrims. This is what Leo XIII. did in 1881.

Take another example, the famous black image of the Virgin of "Monserat," which is fanatically worshipped by numerous pilgrims. It is said that in A.D. 197 a temple of Venus was erected on the mountain and was destroyed by the archangel Michael in person, who, in consequence, became the Patron Saint of the mountain. The stones of the temple were used in building the hermitage of St. Miguel, and a cross in front of the hermitage marks the spot where St. Michael stood. The history of the black image is thus given. The Virgin Mary in her lifetime commanded St. Luke to make it. It was brought by one of the Apostles to Barcelona, where it was worshipped till the conquest of Spain by the Moors, A.D. 717, when it was taken to the mountain for safety (and I suppose forgotten). It was on the 2nd of April that it was safely concealed in a cave, where it remained for 126 years till 808, when it was miraculously discovered.

We need not ask how the above figures are reconciled, as they are quite as worthy of credit as the rest of the legend. The image is the Patroness of Catalonia, and on the 11th of September, 1881, was canonically crowned by Leo XII.—a lying wonder.

I will mention but one more example. The town of Cervera, in the same neighbourhood, bears the honourable character of "*fidelisima*," most faithful, and is under the tutelary guardianship of "*el santísimo misterio*," which is a piece of wood, *a piece of the real cross*. Local chronicles relate how, in 1527, a soldier, serving in the Army of Carlos V. in Rome, stole this piece of wood, and on his death-bed gave it to the priest who administered to him the last rites of the Church. The priest gave it to the Chapter of Cervera. The Protestant idea is, that he who receives stolen property constitutes himself a thief, and cannot get free from the sin till he restores it to its proper owner. Such a thought, however, seems never to have occurred to anyone in Cervera. But the priests of a neighbouring town were very desirous of having a piece of the wood. So, in answer to their earnest request, it was resolved to divide it. After certain appropriate ceremonies the precious relique was placed on a sheet of white paper, and a priest, with a very sharp knife, attempted to cut it, but it resisted all his efforts, and obstinately refused to be cut. But the knife was found to be stained with blood, and at the same instant there was a tremendous clap of thunder which shook the whole town, and the people shouted, "A mystery, a mystery." This was on the 6th of February, 1540. When the Pope Clement VII.

heard of it, he ordered an annual festival, which is still observed in commemoration. It is strange that this piece of wood, which refused to be divided, did not refuse to be separated from its proper place in the cross. Had it done so, there would doubtless have been lightning as well as thunder. And it is strange that a stolen piece of wood should become a protection to those who dishonestly retained possession of it.

It would be difficult to account for the multitude of Romish miracles except as the fulfilment of the prediction in 2 Thess. ii., 9. And when we consider the many ways in which the commandments and ordinances of God have been set aside and changed (as will be shown), it must be confessed that the whole prediction of 2 Thess. ii. is fulfilled in the Church of Rome, for whoever presumes to change God's laws, does thereby set himself above God. So it is evident that the harlot's golden cup is full (Rev. xvii., 2). It would require a very large volume, or rather many large volumes, to give an account of all the lying wonders of the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER III.

THERE is another prophecy which clearly identifies the Church of Rome (1 Tim., iv.): "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits (false teachers, deceivers—1 John iv., 1), and doctrines of devils, by the hypocrisy of liars, having their conscience seared as with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God has created to be received with thanksgiving by them who believe and know the truth." Now, in this case, there are three things especially to be noticed as marks of the apostasy, "the doctrine of devils," "forbidding to marry," and "commanding to abstain from meats." Let us then examine each mark.

I.—"The doctrine of devils" signifies "the doctrine about devils," as we read in Hebrews vi., 1 and 2, "the doctrine of Christ," "the doctrines of baptisms and of laying on of hands, and the resurrection of the dead, and of eternal judgment." So we speak of the doctrine of the Trinity, etc. But the word "devils" is not a right translation. The word in the original is "demons." And in the revised version the margin rightly gives "Greek, demons." But even this does not give a correct idea to the general reader. The word "demon" is

now almost universally understood to mean an evil spirit, or devil. But this is not what the word meant in Greek. It signified any disembodied spirit, or spiritual being, good or bad. If the Greeks had known anything about angels they would have called them demons. The word might even signify a god, and it is so translated in Acts xvii., 18, both in the authorised and revised versions, and also in the Romish translations. It also very commonly signified the spirits of the departed. The spirits of good and great men were regarded and worshipped by both Greeks and Romans as tutelary deities, and exactly corresponded with the guardian angels and patron saints of the Church of Rome. Plato speaks of them as a connecting link between the gods and men, *μέταξυ θεῶν τε καὶ θνῆτων*. This worship was universal both among the heathen Greeks and Romans, only the Romans speaking in Latin called them "manes," or "Genii." So the Emperors after death were called "divi," that is, they were "deified," as we read, "Divus Augustus," etc.

We have examples in the New Testament of the prevailing custom and the use of the word "demon," *δαίμων*. When Paul was preaching in Athens about the death and resurrection of Jesus, the idea of a resurrection was something which was new to the Athenians, which they could not understand; yet, as he spake of the death of Jesus, some of them thought that he was teaching a religion something like their own, and therefore they said: "He seemeth to be a setter forth of 'foreign demons'" (Acts xvii., 18). And in his defence before the court of Areopagus, the A.V. (Acts xvii., 22) trans-

lates the words: "Men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious" (the R.V. somewhat superstitious). But the Apostle could not have used such a term. To the proud Athenians it would have been highly offensive. What he meant, and what they would understand him to mean, was: "I perceive that ye are a very religious people," that is, they were zealously attached to their own religion. But the word which he actually used was *δαισιδαμονεστέρους* "worshippers of demons." There is another example in Acts xxv., 19. Festus, the New Roman Governor of Judea, trying to explain to King Agrippa the charge which the Jews brought against Paul, said that they had certain questions against him of their own "demon-worship," and of one Jesus, who was dead, whom Paul affirmed to be alive. How natural was this language in the mouth of one who knew nothing of the religion of the Jews, but had always been used to demon-worship, or the worship of departed spirits.

The above examples show the prevalence of the worship of demons or souls of the departed, and as superstitions are not easily overcome when multitudes, who had been brought up in the practice, were admitted into the Church, they brought their superstitions with them; and so heathenism was grafted into the Church. And the worship of demons became the worship of saints and angels; as a matter of fact, there was no real change except in name. And as sinners shrink from approaching a holy God, it doubtless would be easy, in an age of ignorance, to persuade them that the saints would be more accessible than God. So the heaven spread,

till it affected the whole Church. And thus (Rev. xvii., 11) was fulfilled: "The beast that was, and is not, even he is the eighth, and is of the seven and goeth into perdition." He is heathen like the seven, his predecessors, for his origin is from them, ἐκ τῶν ἑπτὰ ἐστίν (page 10).

II.—That the prediction about the introduction of saint-worship refers definitely to the Church of Rome will be manifest, when we consider the next mark of the Apostasy (1 Tim. iv., 3), "forbidding to marry." The Church of Rome forbids ecclesiastics of every degree to marry, from the Pope downwards. This is the masterpiece of Satan; for they are in every sense the rulers, and the most important part of the Church. They hold the eternal destinies of the rest of the Church. Without them there could be no sacrament, and therefore no salvation, according to Church teaching. They have the power of retaining or forgiving sins. If a layman needs instruction on any doctrine he must go to the priest, or to some work authorised by the Church, that is, by the Priesthood. Now, why is this all powerful caste in the Church forbidden to marry? Because they are not to know anything of the love of wife or children. Such family ties might increase their attachment also to their country. But such sentiments must, as far as possible, be crushed out of them. They must belong to no country. They must be married to the Church, and the one great object of their lives must be to bring all men into a slavish submission to the authority and teaching of the Church. Now, one might reasonably suppose that as the Church professes to derive all

her power from St. Peter, she would be most careful to follow St. Peter's example. Now, St. Peter certainly was married (Matt. viii., 14). And not only so, but it is equally certain that his wife accompanied him as he went about preaching the gospel. It is equally certain that the rest of the Apostles also, and the brothers of our Lord, were married, and took their wives with them (1 Cor. ix., 5). And so St. Paul claimed for himself the right (if he thought fit to exercise it) of taking with him a Christian wife, and receiving from the Church support for his wife, as well as for himself. Moreover, we are informed that the right of marriage was to continue in the Church, for "marriage is honourable in all men." And we are told (1 Tim. iii., 2) that Bishops and Deacons must be the husbands of one wife. And we are told that Phillip, the evangelist, was married and had four daughters (Acts xxi., 9). But of what importance is the example and teaching of the Apostles compared with the authority of the Church? They are not to be considered.

The Church of Rome forbids all her ministers to marry. And *there is no other Church that does so.* THEREFORE, THE CHURCH OF ROME IS THE ONLY CHURCH TO WHICH THE PROPHECY CAN APPLY; THEREFORE, THE CHURCH OF ROME IS THE GREAT APOSTASY.

III.—Let us now turn to the other mark of the Apostasy (1 Tim. iv., 3): "Commanding to abstain from meats which God created to be received with thanksgiving of them that believe and know the truth." The Church of Rome forbids the eating of flesh on Fridays, or any other day, or

season, which she, without any authority, has pronounced or may pronounce to be days or seasons of fasting. And not only so, but she has attached a most terrible penalty to any act of disobedience in this matter. Such an act is, she declares, a mortal sin, and renders a man **LIABLE TO ETERNAL PUNISHMENT**, which can only be escaped by confession to a priest and obtaining priestly absolution! But St. Paul added to the prediction: "For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving; for it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." Then he told Timothy that he would "be a good steward of Jesus Christ if he put the brethren in remembrance of these things." Jesus also said (Mark vii., 15), "There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile the man." Then he added: "If any man have ears to hear let him hear." By this he emphatically declared, and *called particular attention to the fact*, that eating cannot possibly defile a man, or make him a sinner. But the Church of Rome has decided otherwise, for, according to her teaching, to eat a little flesh on Friday defiles a man to such a degree as to render him liable to eternal torments in hell. This, again, marks the Church of Rome as the great Apostasy, not the infallible "pillar and ground of the truth."

IV.—But the Spirit expressly mentioned another remark of the Apostasy, namely, that it rests upon lies spoken in hypocrisy (1 Tim. iv., 2). Of these the Church of Rome furnishes numerous examples. No doubt some of her departures from the truth

originated in exaggerated rhetorical language, in some cases used without a thought of the language being taken literally, in other cases with the purpose of adding something to what was already believed. But leaving this fruitful source of error, there are abundant proofs that the Church was ready to accept the most audacious lies, if they tended to confirm her downward course of superstition. I will give a single example, "The assumption of the Virgin Mary," a festival of the Romish Church. In the primitive Church little or no notice was taken of the place of burial. The graves of John the Baptist, of the first martyr Stephen, of James who was killed by Herod, and even that of our Lord were soon forgotten. This is proved by the fable of the invention, or finding, of the cross and our Lord's sepulchre by Helena, with all the lying wonders connected with it. Helena is said to have been miraculously guided to the spot. But what need of a miracle if the place had not been forgotten?* So we may rest satisfied that the grave of Mary was soon forgotten. The first sign of honouring her was a tradition which originated a considerable time after the Apostles, which said that she was buried at the foot of the Mount of Olives. Then, in the fourth century, the 15th of August was fixed upon to commemorate the day of her death. This continued till the seventh century, when the story originated, a lie spoken in hypocrisy, that a few days after her death her soul and body were carried up

* So she (that is somebody else in her name) was *miraculously misled* to a spot within Jerusalem, for Jesus was crucified and buried outside Jerusalem.

to Heaven by Jesus and the angels. This fiction was so agreeable to the tendency of the age that it was quickly adopted by the Church, and the day, which till then had been observed to commemorate the death of Mary, was changed into the festival of her assumption! Nor is this all. St. Liguori, in his "Glories of Mary," a work greatly approved by the Church of Rome, gives a full and exact account of the circumstances attending the assumption. Whence did he obtain his information? From his own brains "speaking lies in hypocrisy"!

The Church of Rome is sufficiently identified by the foregoing prophecies. And the marks of identification are *so many and so accurate* that none but God could have drawn the picture. And the identification will be abundantly confirmed by all that follows. Compare her teaching and doings with 2 Thess. ii., 9.

PART II.

THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

CHAPTER I.

By way of introduction to this part of the subject, I may observe that the Church of Rome has laid down a principle, that no part of the Scriptures is to be interpreted except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. But this excludes every attempt at interpretation, for it would be as easy to find the unanimous agreement of all Englishmen on every political question as to find the unanimous consent of the Fathers. There is scarcely a question on which there is not a conflict of opinion among the Fathers, and sometimes they are found to contradict at one time what they wrote at another time. And as the writings of the Fathers are so voluminous that a lifetime is not sufficient to wade through them, it is easy for the advocates of the Church of Rome, by just selecting what suits their purpose (and too often misquoting), and by confounding dates, to make out a plausible case. Still, there are passages which clearly show that the writers could

not possibly have ever heard of doctrines which were held by later writers. Yet these later writers are supposed to be sufficient to prove the doctrines. As a rule it will be found that the Church of Rome prefers the later writers to those who lived nearer to the time of the Apostles. But it is well to get clear of the great fog of quotations and follow the advice of the martyr Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in the third century, "the Church of Rome" calls him St. Cyprian. This is what he says:

"Custom, without truth, is but the antiquity of error; and there is a short way for religious and simple minds to find out what is truth. For if we return to the beginning and original of divine tradition, human error ceases. Thither let us return to our Lord's original, the evangelical beginning, the apostolical tradition, and hence let the reason of our acts arise; from hence order and the beginning arose.

"If, therefore, Christ alone is to be the head, we ought not to regard what another before us thought fit to be done, but what Christ, who is over all, did. For we ought not to follow the customs of men, but the truth of God, since God Himself spake thus by the prophet Isaiah: 'In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrine the commandment of men.' Which very words our Lord again repeats in the Gospel: 'Ye reject the commandments of God that ye may keep your own traditions.' "

Tertullian (A.D. 194), arguing with heretics, required proofs from Scripture. "If it is not written, let them fear the curse allotted to those who add or diminish."

Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, A.D. 386, writes: "Not even the least of the divine and holy mysteries of the faith ought to be handed down without the Divine Scriptures. Do not simply give faith to me, while I am speaking these things to you, except you have proof of what I say from the Holy Word. For the security and preservation of our faith are not supported by ingenuity of speech, but by the proof of the sacred Scriptures."

The whole system of Romanism is founded and built upon tradition. When asked for an authority for relying on tradition, Romanists refer us to 2 Thess. ii., 15: "Stand fast, and hold the traditions, which ye have been taught whether by word or our Epistle." But between the tradition mentioned by St. Paul and the traditions of the Church of Rome there is a great gulf fixed. By traditions, the Church of Rome means some instruction supposed to have been spoken by the Apostles, which was never written, but handed down from age to age. But there is not the shadow of evidence that such traditions ever were spoken by an Apostle, or that they were not the invention of after ages. Very different is the tradition mentioned by St. Paul. In this case there was not a single person between the Apostle and those addressed, and therefore there was no possibility of the introduction of error. And the Apostle calls his letter, as well as the words he spake, tradition, which simply means the instruction he gave them. And it is certain that the words he spake would not contradict the words written. And this is the tradition mentioned by Cyprian. Now, if Cyprian, in the third century, to avoid error

thought that he ought not to regard what others did or taught who were before him, but to go back to the truth of God, how much more ought we, in the twentieth century, to disregard the teaching of those who lived long before us, and "return to the original and beginning of divine teaching," that we may avoid the errors which have accumulated during so many centuries. If we go to the written word of God, there is no human being between us and our Lord and His Apostles; then, as Cyprian says, "human error ceases," because there is no opportunity for man to introduce what is false. The Church of Rome may, and, in fact, does, plead that her teaching is ancient as a reason why we should accept it; *but if it agrees not with the written word of God*, IT IS ONLY, WHAT CYPRIAN CALLS, "THE ANTIQUITY OF ERROR"!

Tested by the word of God, there is NOT A SINGLE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE that is not more or less corrupted by the Church of Rome, some are entirely lost, and some doctrines are added, which have no foundation in truth. Take, for example, the doctrine of the Trinity: there is but ONE GOD, and three persons in the God-head. The Church of Rome in profession acknowledges this, but practically contradicts it by worshipping saints and angels. Of course, this practice must be defended, and one way of doing this is by making distinctions in worship not recognised in God's word. They say that saints may rightly receive the worship of "dulia," and the mother of Jesus "hyperdulia," which, if it means anything, means something more (HOW MUCH?) than "dulia" (pages 75-78, 176-180).

Now "dulia," δουλεία, simply means bond-service. But this is a service which every true Christian owes to *God alone* (Eph. vi., 6; Rom. i., 1; James i., 1; 2 Peter i., 1). So on true conversion everyone becomes the bondservant of God (Rom. vi., 22). St. Paul reminded the Galatians, that before their conversion they "did service (dulia) to them which by nature are no gods." So the Church of Rome renders "dulia, service, to them which are no gods." And contrary to our Lord's word (Luke xvi., 13) tries to divide the service, which belongs to God only, between God and the saints. And which in the multitude of cases obtains the greater part will be seen.

CHAPTER II.

FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Now, though the Church of Rome does not give the name of gods to the saints, it certainly invests them with some of the attributes of God, which is practically making them gods, which is a direct violation of the First Commandment. Investing them with the attributes of God is of far greater consequence than the mere giving them the name of gods, for the objects of heathen worship are, and I might say always have been, called gods (1 Cor. viii., 5). And if the saints are not really gods, how can they in Heaven hear the prayers addressed to them on earth, and that, too, in a multitude of places at the same time? In reply to this, it is sometimes said that the prayers are not really addressed to the saints, but simply express a desire to have an interest in their intercessions. But where are we told that they do intercede for us? We have only one Mediator (1 Tim. ii., 5). But, passing by this for the present, we may ask, if prayers to the saints are not addressed to the saints, *to whom are they addressed?* If it is said that they are addressed to God, the case stands thus:—A servant has grievously offended his master, so he goes to him and says, “Sir, will you please to ask or command my

fellow servant to ask you to forgive me?" Did anyone on earth ever act so absurdly? Sometimes it is said that such prayers are not authorised by the Church. But if anyone will consider the language of the prayers to the saints and angels, which are undoubtedly authorised by the Church, he must see, unless he is blinded by prejudice, that they are really addressed to saints and angels. I will quote two prayers given in a little book, "What every Christian must know and do," which had the late Cardinal Cullen's imprimatur: "Dearest Mary, Mother of Jesus, speak to Jesus and ask Him to have pity on me and forgive me." "Dearest Mary, Mother of Jesus, make my heart pure from sin. My dear angel guardian, lead me to the altar of my God." If these prayers are not addressed to Mary, and the second to the angel also, there is no meaning in language. And the first makes Jesus to be no mediator at all, Mary is the mediator, and the second asks (and I suppose expects) her to do what none but God can do.

But the Church is responsible for many prayers which go much beyond those above quoted. The writings of Saint (?) Liguori afford abundant proofs of this. When he was canonised, the Church declared authoritatively that there was nothing in his writings contrary to the truth. The Church therefore cannot now repudiate what he wrote without denying her own infallibility. But the Church has never questioned any part of his writings, but still recommends them. Cardinals Wiseman and Manning were admirers of Ligouri. From the many things in his writings, which Protestants cannot but

regard as blasphemous, I quote the following from "The Glories of Mary": "O, immaculate Virgin, we are under thy protection, and therefore we have recourse TO THEE ALONE: and we beseech thee to prevent thy beloved Son, who is irritated by our sins, from abandoning us to the power of the devil." And again: "He that is under the protection of Mary will be saved, he who is not will be lost." And this teaching is confirmed by a famous painting in Rome which speaks to all, learned and ignorant. Two ladders are represented as reaching to Heaven; over one Jesus presides, and Mary over the other. All who attempt to ascend by the one over which Jesus presides only fall back to be hurt. But everyone who tries to ascend by the one over which Mary presides goes up without difficulty. Such teaching is unmistakable. Can it be a matter of surprise that they who accept such teaching WORSHIP THE CREATURE MORE THAN THE CREATOR? Spain is the most "Catholic" country in Europe. One who had been a priest in Spain in a letter to me said, "The religion of my poor country is not Christianity, but *Marianity*." Knowing what I do, I was surprised on asking a Romanist, "Why do you pray to the Virgin?" to get the answer, "Because we are too wicked to pray to God. But Mary is so loving and kind that we may go to her at any time. She is a true mother to us." With her, prayer to God was not to be thought of. God was to her a stern, hard, unforgiving being. Jesus was not thought of as a mediator. But Mary occupied in her heart the place of God; and she was the mediator with the unloving, unlovable being called God.

Proofs and quotations from Romish writers, Popes, Cardinals and Bishops for the extravagant worship of the Virgin might be given sufficient to fill volumes. She is always spoken of and addressed in terms of the tenderest affection. One who had been brought up in the Church of Rome, but through the teaching of God's word had been compelled to leave it, said to me, "It would be impossible to describe the pain it gave me to tear the worship of the Virgin from my heart."

THIRD COMMANDMENT.

(The Second, according to the Church of Rome.)

It will be seen from what has been said that the worship of saints, especially of the Virgin, is not only a direct violation of the First Commandment, but it is a grievous violation of the third. It is not a simple, thoughtless taking the name of God in vain, but it deliberately makes the love and sympathy of God inferior to that of a creature. It denies the plain declaration, "God is love." It sets aside the mediatorship of Jesus, since there is need of a mediator between the sinner and Jesus. It contradicts the plain declaration that "there is none other name (than Jesus) under Heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved." Mary is, in fact, made the Saviour. I have known more than one

case of Romanists who would take God's name in vain, in profane language, who seemed almost provoked to violence if a word were spoken which they thought disrespectful to the Virgin.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

(Omitted by the Church of Rome.)

THE next thing I would notice is that the Church of Rome is in direct opposition to the word of God in the worship of images. In Protestant countries the worship of images is often flatly and indignantly denied. Various explanations and excuses are made for that which the Church teaches or allows. It is said that the images are to fix the thoughts, to assist the devotion, etc., that the honour and reverence, or acts of devotion before the image, are not offered to the image, but to that which the image represents. As to the images being a help to devotion, they are certainly no help to the devotion which God requires. *The only help which the word of God recognises is that of the Holy Spirit.* To rely on any other is idolatry (John iv., 23 and 24). The more intelligent Hindoos of the present day would tell you that they do not worship the idol, but that which the idol represents. And it is a fact, as we learn from early Christian writers, that pagans in their days used the same defence of their image worship. Thus, in the third century, Arnobius, once

a zealous idolater, reasoned with idolaters: "You say, 'We worship the gods through the images.' What then? If the images did not exist, would the gods not know that they were worshipped, nor be aware of any honour being done to them by you? What can be more unjust, more disrespectful, more cruel than to recognise one as a god, and offer supplication to another thing, to hope for help from a divine being, and pray to an image, which has no sense?"

Other early Christian writers also deal in a similar manner with the pagan excuses for the idols. And Lactantius, at the end of the third century, says plainly, "Beyond all doubt, where an image is there is no religion."

But let us take another example still more to the point, the golden calf made by the Israelites in the wilderness (Exodus xxxii.). Was that intended to be, or was it regarded by the Israelites in the wilderness as a God? Moses, under the direct guidance of God, had led them out of Egypt. But when he continued a long time in the mount, they lost all hope of seeing him again. So they wanted *something to supply the place of Moses*. They therefore said to Aaron, "Make us 'ELOHIM' to go before us, for as for this Moses, the man who brought us out of the land of Egypt, we know not what is become of him." That word "Elohim," though it is in the plural, is there wrongly translated "gods." There was only one golden calf. More than 2,000 times it is used to express the one true God, as in Gen. i., 1, and is rightly translated God. And so it ought to be

translated here. The word is never applied to any single false god. By the use of this word, therefore, it is evident that the people had no intention of leaving the worship of God, who had brought them out of Egypt.

Next, when the calf was made, it was said, "This is thy God (Elohim), which brought thee out of Egypt" (see Neh. ix., 18). Now, was there a single man among the 600,000 who thought that that calf had brought them out? Impossible. They all knew that the calf had no existence when they came out. It was only a symbol, a sign of God (see Augustin's argument, page 97). And this is confirmed by the expression, "To-morrow is a feast to the Lord (Jehovah)," a name never applied to any except to the one living and true God. Whatever worship, therefore, they intended to offer before the calf was meant for Jehovah. Yet every act of worship before it was idolatry, and punished as idolatry. So every act of worship before a cross, or crucifix, or any image is idolatry. And whatever argument, or excuse, may be put forward in defence of these, might have been equally urged in defence of the golden calf. No doubt to OUR minds this latter may seem a grosser form of idolatry, but if it had been the image of a man, or anything else, it would have been equally contrary to God's law. In this matter the Church of Rome stands *self-convicted* by her omitting the Second Commandment, which says, "Thou shalt not bow down to them nor worship them," and dividing the Tenth Commandment into two *to conceal the omission*, by thus making ten. No satisfactory

reason can be given for this omission, except the consciousness that the practice was idolatrous, and condemned by the Commandment. In the primitive Church images were unknown, but in after ages, when the Church became more lax, various changes were made to make it easier for pagans to become Christians. (CHRISTIANS WITHOUT GIVING UP THEIR PAGANISM.) So images were allowed on the plea of assisting the memory, etc., but they were soon treated like the images of Jupiter. The evil once admitted rapidly spread, so that in the eighth century it caused not only bitter controversy, but civil war between the worshippers of images and the breakers of images. *The Popes Gregory II. and Gregory III. not only took the side of the image worshippers, but Gregory II. went so far as to say that the Emperor Leo did not deserve the name of Christian, BECAUSE HE ORDERED ALL IMAGES TO BE DESTROYED.* The son of Leo, Constantine, called a Council of Eastern Bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 754, at which the worship of images was condemned. But Pope Adrian, A.D. 786, assembled a Council at Nice, in Bithynia, at which the decrees of the Council of Constantinople were reversed. The worship of images and the cross was established; and *penalties decreed against those who said that only God was to be worshipped and adored.* Thus in the Church of Rome image worship gained the victory. Hence, as this practice could not be reconciled with God's word, it became necessary to adapt God's word to the practice by omitting the Second Commandment. Thus the title of the book before quoted, "What every Christian must know and

do," by its omission most plainly signifies that Christians ought not to know that God says, "Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them."

This worship of images is manifested by various outward acts besides bowing down, or bending the knee. Kissing the images, or cross, is an act of worship (1 Kings xix., 18), so is burning incense before them (2 Kings xviii., 4), similarly burning candles or lamps before an image, as is done before the image of the Virgin in Spain, and the burning of candles on the altar are idolatrous. *The burning of candles before an image is a marked feature of the worship of Buddhists and other idolaters.*

It may also be observed that pilgrimages to the tombs of the saints are of purely pagan origin. The heathen Greeks and Romans believed that the souls of the departed frequented the place of their sepulchre, therefore it would be natural to think that that would be the fittest place for honouring them. And the next step to reverencing their bones and reliques is an easy one, and opens the way to endless impostures.

FOURTH COMMANDMENT. R.C. THIRD.

IN Catholic countries the Sabbath is but little regarded. After Mass the day may be spent in any kind of amusement. In Spain it is the day almost invariably chosen for bull fights, and priests attend to administer the last rites of the Church if anyone should be mortally injured. St. Liguori says that

the Pope may decree that the Lord's Day may continue only for a few hours, thus limiting God's law. And Bellarmine, in 1519, with the approval of the Pope, in stating the Commandments, gave the fourth "Recordate de Santificare le feste," "Remember to keep the Holy Festival," substituting man's law for God's (2 Thess. ii., 4).

FIFTH COMMANDMENT. R.C. FOURTH.

THE Church of Rome takes away much of this Commandment by making the authority of the priest as spiritual father (pages 16 and 17) greater than that of father and mother. And as it is a sin for parents not to send a child to confession when seven years old, the priest may get such an influence over the child that it may become, and unconsciously for life remain, a mere tool in the priest's hands. Further, the Church of Rome sets light by this Commandment whenever it would stand in the way of making converts of young persons who ought to be under the direction and control of their parents, enjoining secrecy till the work of perversion is complete.

SIXTH COMMANDMENT. R.C. FIFTH.

WE have before alluded to the multitude of Christians who have been tortured and murdered by the Church of Rome for no other crime than refusing

to accept what they believed to be contrary to the plain teaching of the word of God. For these murders and cruelties the Church has never expressed one word of regret, but still boasts of being unchanged, and, no doubt, if circumstances would allow, it is unchanged in this respect. But the Church knows how to adopt her mode of acting to the time and circumstances, but the spirit is the same. But the authoritative writings of the Church frequently manifest a persecuting spirit where we should expect more caution. No doubt there are many kind-hearted priests, yet it is a fact that where priests have power, and in proportion as they have power and influence, a persecuting spirit, and hatred of those, whom they call heretics, prevail, as is manifest in Spain and other Catholic countries, and even in Ireland, as an example, the persistent persecution of Dr. Long and others. Mr. F. Hugh O'Donnell, M.A., who for several years was a Member of Parliament, and is a sincere member of the Church of Rome (he is not an enemy of religious education, but is an enemy of priestly control of secular education whether elementary or University), has lately published a volume entitled "The Ruin of Education in Ireland and the Irish Fanar," in which he gives some extracts from a book published two years before, written by the learned "Father" Marianus de Luca, S.J., Canonist and Theologian of the Gregorian University of the Vatican. This modern Jesuit writes under the eyes of the Pope as follows: "The Catholic Church has the right and the duty to kill heretics, because it is by fire and sword that heresy can be extirpated.

F

Mere excommunication is derided by heretics. If they are imprisoned or exiled they corrupt others. The only resource is to put them to death. Repentance cannot save them, just as repentance is not allowed to save civil criminals, for the highest good of the Church is the unity of the Faith, and this cannot be preserved unless heretics are put to death. Outlaws may be lawfully killed by anybody who meets them. Civil society exists to obey the very nod of the Catholic Church; therefore a prince or government refusing to kill heretics, when required by the Catholic Church, ceases to possess the rights of a civil society. A good shepherd kills the wolves which attack the sheep; heretics corrupting Catholics are wolves attacking sheep; therefore the Catholic Church, as a good shepherd, ought to kill heretics."

Now, as "Father" Marianus wrote and published this under the eyes of the Pope, Cardinals and Bishops of Rome, we may certainly conclude that he expressed the sentiments of the Church of Rome. Had he written anything contrary to the Church's teaching, his book would have been condemned and put in the index of prohibited books. Those quotations show (and they might be abundantly confirmed by other Romish writers) that the Roman Catholic Church fosters, as far as possible, sentiments of violent hatred against heretics. They suggest an interpretation of the Sixth Commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," the very opposite to that given by our Lord and His Apostles (Matt. v., 21 and 22, and 45 and 46; Luke ix., 54-56;

1 John iii., 15, iv., 20): "He that hateth his brother is a murderer." No doubt there are many Romanists who are in this and other matters much better than their Church.

Still, we may ask, who are responsible for the murder of the late John Kensit and of Murphy, who, whilst lecturing in his own hired room at Whitehaven, in 1871, was murdered by an Irish mob, which had marched into the town a distance of four or five miles for the purpose, and took possession of the room half an hour before the lecture commenced? Dr. Crothy, a former President of Maynooth, stated before the Commissioners of Irish Education, that Maldonatus' Commentary was a text book for the students. In that commentary (Matt. xiii., 20) it is asserted that "they who deny that heretics ought to be put to death, ought much rather to deny that murderers ought to be put to death." And the attention of the students is specially directed to this passage. St. Thomas Aquinas, another class book, is quoted affirming, that "heretics are justly punished with death." And Cabasutius, the class book on Canon Law, gives the Canon Law of the Church of Rome, the Third Canon of the IV. Council of Lateran to the same effect in similar language. Many other works of recognised authority in the Church of Rome teach the duty of exterminating heretics whenever it is possible; as Gilmartin's "Manual of Church History," which is also a text book in Maynooth. Therefore, when the students thus instructed, and having that instruction abundantly confirmed by the practice of the Church go forth as priests, will they not impart

and enforce their opinions on those whom they are appointed to teach? Can it therefore be any wonder that an ignorant Irish mob, being so instructed by the priest, whom they regard with reverence, should consider violence done to a heretic, or even murder, as no great crime, but rather as meritorious? And if one so guilty should confess the deed to the priest, if such confession were necessary, or if others, to secure the acquittal of the guilty one, should swear falsely, is it at all likely that the priest, with his feeling against heretics, and his opinions, which he has imbibed from the Church, would regard the deed as deserving severe censure? No, it is evident that the guilt in such cases lies, in the first place, at the door of the Church of Rome for giving such diabolical instruction.

SEVENTH COMMANDMENT. ROMISH VI.

IF we would rightly judge whether the description of the apostasy in Rev. and 2 Thess. ii. refer to the Church of Rome, we are not simply to look at that Church as it appears in the present with the eyes of the civilised world upon it, with its restraining influence, but consider it when it had full power, and could act without restraint when a threat from the Pope could reduce a rebellious prince or people to submission. But it may be observed that *the period of the Church's greatest*

power was the period of its greatest moral corruption. With comparatively few exceptions this applies to Popes, Cardinals, Bishops and Clergy. In the whole history of the world there could not be found a more loathsome character than Pope Alexander VI. He was destitute not only of religion, but of every feeling of decency or shame. He was guilty of perjury, treachery, licentiousness, murder, incest, etc. He had four sons by a concubine, and a daughter, the infamous Lucretia Borgia, who left her husband and lived in incestuous intercourse with her brother, Cæsar Borgia, and her own father the Pope. Pastor, who wrote "The Lives of the Popes," approved of by Leo XIII., paints his life in the blackest colours, and quotes Farrante, who was intimate with him, as saying, "He leads such a life that every one recoils from him with horror." He also tells us that he obtained the papacy by the most flagrant bribery. But this is a most serious condemnation of the Church, in which such a thing was possible, for they who received the bribe were as guilty as he who paid it. Most of the monastic orders were mere herds of idle, ignorant, dishonest, immoral people (see pages 276-280). The rich monks, as the Benedictines and Augustinians, by their disregard of their rules and licentiousness, rendered themselves extremely odious. So it might be said that the Seventh Commandment was but little regarded, or not at all, by those who were supposed to have been specially appointed by God to govern, teach, and guide mankind, and perform all the sacred rites and ceremonies of the Church. No

doubt these things hastened and helped forward the glorious Reformation which the Court of Rome now curses in her desire to recover her lost power, which, if recovered, would doubtless reproduce the same moral results. "Like causes produce like results."

Peter Favre, one of the companions of the founder of the Jesuits, in a letter written from Worms, whither he had been sent by Ignatius Lovola in 1514, wrote: "The apostasy of so many countries, the rebellion of so many cities and provinces, is to be attributed, not to the garbled scriptures, not to the plots, open or secret, of the Lutherans, but to the scandalous lives of the clergy. Would to God that there were in this city of Worms but two or three priests not living in concubinage, or guilty of other public and notorious crimes" ("The Life of the Blessed Peter Favre," by the Jesuit, Guiseppe Bacro).

The above is mild condemnation compared with what other Roman Catholic writers state. The late Pope Leo XIII. testified of the historian Baronius that he was a faithful writer, "who has never been equalled." Now this faithful writer gives the following account of the Popes and Bishops of the tenth century: "What was then the face of the Holy Roman Church? How most foul! When harlots, at once most powerful and most base, ruled at Rome, at whose will Sees were changed, Bishops were presented, and what is horrid to hear and unutterable, pseudo Pontiffs, their paramours, were intruded into the See of Peter" (Annal. Eccels., A.D. 912). Holy Church, indeed! Then, what would be unholy?

The profligacy and wickedness of the Popes were diligently copied by the Bishops and clergy, and the whole state of society was corrupted. Cardinal Bellarmine also said that "some years before the Lutheran and Calvinistic heresies, according to the testimony of those who were then living, there was an almost abandonment of equity in the ecclesiastical judgments, no discipline in morals, no learning in sacred literature, no reverence in divine things; religion was almost extinct."

These three Romish writers (the number might be multiplied) show us that for 600 years before the Reformation the Church of Rome was a foul mass of corruption. And beyond doubt for a still longer time, for it could not have come to such an utterly depraved state all at once, A.D. 912. Mr. H. Fowler, Secretary of the Protestant Alliance, in a four-page Tract, has compiled from the writings of the Cardinals Baronius and Bellarmine, the Jesuits Labbe and Copart, Platina, keeper of the Vatican Library under Pope Sextus IV., and other *Romish historians*, evidence of the characters of a number of Popes. They describe some of them as monsters, heretics, usurpers, murderers, tyrants, robbers, adulterers, apostates, guilty of incest and unnatural crimes. Some of them obtained the Popedom by bribery, by violence, or by the influence of harlots. For every single expression he gives authority by quotations, and states the edition and page from which each quotation is taken. Yet Romanists boast of Apostolic Succession! Apostolic Succession! Is it possible that the Grace of God could have been confined to such a filthy

channel? No doubt there were some exceptions, for God never left Himself without witnesses. But most of these sealed their testimony with their blood, and their murderers called them heretics.

EIGHTH COMMANDMENT. ROMISH VII.

THIS Commandment does not escape mutilation by the Church of Rome. St. Liguori, whose writings at the time of his canonisation were said to have been examined twenty times and pronounced by the Church to be free from error, says, that "a servant may, according to his own judgment, compensate himself for his labours if he thinks that he deserves more wages than he has received." I believe that it is no uncommon thing for a man to set a higher value upon his own work than anyone else would do. How convenient for satisfying the conscience of such a man, if he should feel disposed to help himself to his master's property, to think that he had the authority of this saint, and therefore of the Church! Take another example in "The Moral Theology" of Baily, which some years ago was (and perhaps still is) the text book for the education of priests in the College of Maynooth. In chapter 37, page 232, there occurs this question: "How much must be stolen to constitute a mortal sin?" To answer this, he says, that mankind are divided into four classes—1. Those who live in luxury. 2. Those

who live on their own estates. 3. Tradesmen, artificers, and those who earn their living by their labour. 4. The poor. For the third class sixty pence must be stolen to constitute mortal sin! Anything less than that, therefore, fifty-nine pence, for example, would be only a venial sin, as if any transgression of God's law could be a venial matter. How different is the teaching of our Lord (Luke xvi., 10): "He that is unjust in the least is unjust also in much," and (St. James ii., 10), "He that keepeth the whole law and yet offendeth in one point is guilty of all." But of course the Church has a right to set aside or modify the Commandments of God! (see remarks on Commandment IV.).

Again, I find in "What every Christian must know and do," with Cardinal Cullen's imprimatur, page 26, this explanation: "If you steal from different persons, it needs half as much again for a mortal sin—and the same if you steal at different times. If you steal from different persons, as well as at different times, it needs double the sum." Surely this makes habitual dishonesty less sinful than a single act! Again, page 27: "It is a sin to mix something with what you sell, for example, water with any liquor, except there is a common custom of doing it, and it is necessary in order to gain a reasonable profit." This is setting aside God's law, making the practice of dishonest tradesmen the rule, and leaving everyone at liberty, according to his conscience, or want of conscience, to decide for himself what would be a reasonable profit. This exactly agrees with Ligouri's rule for servants stated above.

NINTH COMMANDMENT. R.C. VIII.

WE need not dwell long on this. We may conclude that they who would kill "heretics" for the benefit of the Church would not hesitate to bear false witness against them. And, in fact, most monstrously false charges were often brought against the Reformers, whose only crime was that they refused to submit to the teaching of the Church, which they regarded as corrupt. The notes on the previous Commandments sufficiently show that it would not be regarded as a mortal sin, if a sin at all, to break this Commandment, if the Church could in any way be benefited thereby.

TENTH COMMANDMENT. R.C. IX. AND X.

WHEN we consider the vast wealth accumulated by the Church of Rome, and the many ways in which that wealth was obtained, it would be impossible to acquit the Church of habitually breaking this Commandment. For example, was it not covetousness that gave Tetzel the commission for the sale of indulgences? He was commissioned to sell indulgences for every kind of sin, the price to be according to the nature of the sin, and the circumstances of the persons by whom, and against whom, the sin was committed. So Tetzel exhorted his hearers to pay liberally, then, however enormous the crime might be, it would be at once cancelled. Moreover, these indulgences were good not only

for past sins, but also were equally good for sins, however great, which anybody wished to commit.

As in that age of ignorance and superstition the Pope's authority was not questioned, Tetzl no doubt met with success. But the impudence with which this blasphemous and iniquitous traffic was urged fired the soul of Luther with indignation and a determination to protest against it. But when the protest did begin, it was necessary to protest against many other things. But it was not only by indulgences that the Church of Rome violated the Tenth Commandment, but in many other ways. Was not the Pope's exaction of Annates, or the first year's income, of every spiritual benefice throughout Christendom an act of covetousness? At first it was levied only on those who were appointed to bishoprics, afterwards on the inferior clergy. And this iniquitous extortion was increased by appointing aged men, or such as were not likely to live long.

The Roman Catholic princes of Germany, assembled in Diet at Nuremberg in 1522, presented to Pope Adrian VI. a list of one hundred grievances, in which they set forth the numerous ways in which money was exacted; from which it is evident that avarice was A RULING PASSION of the Church of Rome, so that there was no wickedness that could not be indulged in by the payment of money. They began by describing the enormous wickedness encouraged by Indulgences. They state how priests extort money out of the laity; how Bishops extort money out of the priests for concubinage; how ecclesiastics persuade men at the approach of death

to defraud their own legitimate heirs. The fear of purgatory afforded them a powerful argument in this method of obtaining wealth. Was it not against this kind of thing that the "law of mortmain" was passed in this country, to prevent lands being so transferred to the Church? Such a statute was passed in the reign of Edward I., 1279. It was made sufficiently comprehensive to embrace all corporate bodies, but the title "*De Religiosis*" shows clearly that it was in reality aimed against the doings of ecclesiastics.

Here, I may observe, that an indulgence is not a pardon, though it is often spoken of as such, even by some Popes. "*Indulgentia*" in late Latin writers signified a remission of taxes, or of punishment, in whole or in part, and this is its use in the Church of Rome. According to Romish doctrine, it is the priest who pardons sin; that is, remits the eternal punishment due to mortal sins; but the temporal punishment of them, and of all venial sins, must be endured by the sinner himself either in this world or in purgatory. But all that a man can do in this world in the way of atonement, compared with purgatory, as described by the Church, is so light that it may well be neglected. It is for the remission, in whole or in part, of these purgatorial sufferings that indulgences are granted. But it is not easy to see why a plenary indulgence should not be called a pardon with regard to venial sins, as well as the priest's remission, if the punishment of mortal sins is called a pardon. But the priest's pardon, as there is still punishment to be endured in purgatory, is not very like the pardon

of Scripture (Heb. x., 17 and 18; Acts xiii., 38 and 39; Isaiah liii., 4-6; Jer. xxxi., 34; Rom. iv., 25, v., 1, viii., 33 and 34).

CHAPTER III.

SUPEREROGATION.

HAVING seen something of the way the Church of Rome treats God's Commandments, I will turn to a very kindred subject, the doctrine of Supererogation. Supererogation signifies good works over and above what are required. The doctrine implies that a man may be better than he need to be! Yea, that the saints have not only earned merit sufficient for themselves, but have also laid up a stock of merit, which may be applied according to the will of the Pope, for the benefit of those that fall short. No doubt by sophistry, by making unscriptural distinctions and definitions, by treating the Commandments in a manner opposed to that of our Lord and His Apostles, Romanists may make out a plausible case for those who know not the Scriptures, ignorance of which the Church of Rome has always fostered. But to those who are well acquainted with the Bible, that doctrine is palpably absurd. For there is nothing more plainly and constantly affirmed in the word of God than the fact that all are sinners, so that "every mouth is stopped and all the world are guilty before God," and "there can be no boasting." But the doctrine of Supererogation opens a very wide door for boasting to the so-

called saints. But let us put it to a very simple test. Suppose that we take any one work of supererogation performed by a saint. Being a work of supererogation it was not really required or necessary. Supposing, then, that the saint had left it undone, what would have been the consequence? The neglect would have condemned him as a sinner, for "To him that knoweth to do good and doeth it not, to him it is a sin" (James iv., 17), and "He that keepeth the whole law and yet offendeth in one point is guilty of all" (James ii., 10), that is to say, the work of supererogation was required, and therefore was not a work of supererogation. which proves the Romish doctrine absurd when tried by the word of God. And so says common sense.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SACRAMENTS.

THE Church of Rome says that there are seven sacraments, Confirmation, Matrimony, Extreme Unction, Penance, Holy Orders, Baptisms, and the Holy Eucharist. Protestants admit Baptism and the Lord's Supper. These, for the present, we will pass over.

CONFIRMATION.

THERE is no mention of any rite of confirmation in the Bible. The word is used in the Acts of the Apostles to signify that St. Paul confirmed the Churches by exhorting them to continue in the faith (Acts xiv., 22). When a child has been baptised, there comes a time when he ought, of his own will, to make an open confession of faith and purpose to obey God before being recognised as a full member of the Church. And every Church has a right to determine the circumstances connected with this confirmation provided that nothing be ordained contrary to, or inconsistent with, the word of God. In praying for, or pronouncing a blessing upon, the person who thus confirms the promise made for him in baptism, it is a very natural way for

ON WHAT DOES THE BLESSING DEPEND? 81

the Bishop, or pastor of the Church, to lay his hand on the head, as Jacob did in blessing the sons of Joseph. But the blessing really depends, not on the laying on of hands, but on the sincerity and faith of the person. But the Church of Rome makes it independent of these conditions, for I find it stated that "Confirmation is given commonly not before they have come to a state of reason." To talk of confirming one void of reason is absurd. But it would appear that the only thing requisite is the laying on of the hands of the Bishop, and then the person is confirmed, whether he knows it or not! Then, again, it is said: "The Holy Ghost also makes in your soul a beautiful bright mark called a character, which can never be lost." Where did the Church gain this piece of information? Who ever saw the bright mark? And what becomes of this imperishable mark, if the person dies in mortal sin and perishes?

CHAPTER V.

"THE SACRAMENT OF MARRIAGE."

MARRIAGE was instituted in Paradise, and throughout the Old Testament there is not the slightest intimation that it was a sacrament, or that a priest was required to perform a marriage ceremony. If there had been such a requirement, it would be impossible to imagine how the mention of it could have been omitted, when we consider how minutely the priest's duties are described. The New Testament made no change. But, because St. Paul likens the union of a man and his wife to Christ's union with His Church and calls it a great mystery, the Church of Rome makes it a sacrament. A mystery, *μυστήριον*, properly means a revealed secret, and such is the union of Christ with His Church (see Ephes. v., 25-33). It is neither more nor less than God's union with His Church under the Mosaic covenant (Jer. iii., 14; Isaiah liv., 5). Our Lord, to show the binding nature of marriage, referred it to its institution, not to any priestly function (Mark x., 6-9). But the Church of Rome, by making it a sacrament, renders the services of a priest necessary, which not only secures a fee, but gives him an influence far beyond the value of a fee.

CHAPTER VI.

THE SACRAMENT OF EXTREME UNCTION.

EXTREME UNCTION UNSCRIPTURAL.

THERE is no authority for the practice in Scripture, much less for making it a sacrament. Anointing with oil is mentioned by St. Mark and St. James, but in each case with the object and expectation of restoring the sick, and for a similar purpose was used by the Good Samaritan. It was a common remedy. But extreme unction is only applied when all hope of life is past, so that there is not the slightest resemblance of the two cases. But extreme unction invests the priest with great importance and influence, for in the most solemn moments of life, when all hope is past, the priest is supposed to confer on the dying some undefined blessing. Of course, those who believe in it cannot help looking on the priest with some sort of reverence. But for this there is not the shadow of authority in God's word.

St. James directed the sick to call, **NOT THE PRIEST**, but the elders of the Church (Acts xiv., 23; Tit. i., 5). The object of calling for them was that they might unitedly (Matt. xviii., 19 and 20) pray for the sick. But prayer does not exclude the use of means. Even if we had a definite promise from God, it would be our duty to use the means. See the case of Hezekiah (2 Kings xx.). He prayed, a promise of recovery was given, but he had to use the remedy. So the elders were to pray, and use the common remedy. What has this to do with "extreme unction"?

CHAPTER VII.

PENANCE.

PENANCE, this is the shortened form of the Latin word "pœnitentia," which signifies sorrow for sin. To "do penance," therefore, is equivalent to "*do repentance*." Now, in Latin there is no verb to express "to repent," but it was expressed by the words, "agere pœnitentiam." To translate these words separately, "agere" signifies "to do," "pœnitentiam," "repentance." But when joined together no one in reading any Latin book would ever think of translating them in any other way than "to repent." But whilst the expression "to do repentance" is absurd, this absurd *imitation* of the Latin is not only tolerated by the Church of Rome, but is made the foundation of "a sacrament."

Let us consider this sacrament. "It consists of contrition or heartfelt sorrow for sin, confession to a priest, satisfaction or the acceptance and performance of some penitential and painful work prescribed by the priest as an atonement for the sin. The form of the sacrament is the sentence of absolution pronounced by the priest." Dr. Robertson, in "The Roman Catholic Church in Italy," gives abundant proofs that these pardons can be obtained

for money. As "the Scriptures are given by the inspiration of God, and are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works" (2 Tim. iii., 16 and 17), we should expect that if this sacrament were according to the will of God, it would be frequently mentioned. But there is not one single reference to confession to a priest. No doubt there may be found expressions which, *supposing the doctrine to be true*, may, with a little ingenuity, be adapted to the doctrine, but as proofs they are worthless. So mere adaptations to other doctrines are of no value. But we find frequent directions to confess our sins to God. And St. James tells us to confess our sins one to another (not to a priest), that is, if one Christian offends against another, he ought to confess his fault to the offended one, and he, the injured one, ought to forgive, and also ask God to forgive. There is not a single passage in the Bible which speaks of confession to a priest, or of priestly absolution. Yet Romanists confidently quote (John xx., 23): "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained," as giving authority to the Apostles and their successors to hear confessions and to forgive sins. But there is not in that sentence a *word about confession in any sense*, nor a word about *the transmission of authority*. But two questions need a definite answer. First, "To whom were the words addressed?" Second, "What is the meaning of the words?"

St. John tells us that the words were addressed to

the Disciples gathered together for fear of the Jews (verse 19) on the evening of the Resurrection. But disciples does not mean apostles only. Jesus had then many Disciples, but only eleven Apostles. But St. Luke gives us the meaning of disciples in this case. He tells us (xxiv., 33) that they were "the eleven gathered together," and τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς, "THE WITH THEM," a common Greek expression signifying "their party," "those who agreed with them," "*their fellow disciples*," and ought to be so translated. So in verse 24 we read "some of THE WITH US," some of our party. And again, in Acts v., 17, we read in Greek, "the high priest and all THE WITH HIM," not persons present with him, but all his party, namely, "all the sect of the Sadducees," as it is there explained. It is by that explanation that we know that the high priest was a Sadducee. From St. Luke, therefore, we learn that our Lord's words were addressed to the whole body of Disciples. It does not necessarily mean that all were present. Thomas was absent. But it certainly means that none were excluded; the two Disciples who returned from Emmaus were present (Luke xxiv., 33). And as they were "gathered together for fear of the Jews" (John xx., 19), it is certain that the women would not be shut out. So the words of Jesus were addressed to the women as well as to the men. Exactly as we are told (Acts i., 14 and 15), that the Disciples "continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and His brethren." So on the day of Pentecost (Acts ii., 1-4), "They were *all with one accord* in one

TO WHOM JOHN XX., 23, WAS ADDRESSED. 87

place," when the Holy Spirit came "upon each of them" (on each woman as well as upon each man), "and they were all (women as well as men, see verses 16-18) filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance." To confine this outpouring of the Spirit to the Apostles, or to say that the women did not equally receive the gifts, is a flat contradiction of God's word. So, in like manner, to say that the women did not receive the Holy Spirit (John xx., 22), or to deny that the words of Jesus (xx., 23) were addressed to them, is equally a flat contradiction of God's word. Therefore, whatever power or authority was given in those words were given to the whole Church, and not to the Apostles only.

Next, what is the meaning of the words? Remember that Jesus was a Jew speaking to Jews, in the Jews language, in their own idiom, in which a person is often said to do a thing, when he simply states that it is or will be done. Many examples might be quoted, as (Gen. xli., 13) Pharaoh's butler said of Joseph, "me he restored unto my office, him he hanged." Joseph did nothing of the kind, he only said what would be done. Again, when Jeremiah was called to be a prophet, the Lord said unto him (i., 10): "See, I have this day set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms to root out, to pull down, to destroy, to build and to plant." How did Jeremiah fulfil this duty? Simply by declaring the conditions on which God Himself would do all these things. So Isaiah vi., 10. So St. John xx., 23, simply means that the Disciples were to make known the conditions on which God Him-

self would grant or refuse remission of sins, and, at the same time, Jesus told them what these conditions were (Luke xxiv., 47), "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached unto all nations in His name," that is, repentance and faith in Him (see John iii., 36; of the meaning of repentance, see page 95). And this direction they constantly followed. And St. Paul also (Acts xx., 21) summed up his teaching in "Repentance towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." But no Apostle ever pretended to have power to forgive sins, and this fact alone is sufficient to prove the Romish doctrine wrong.

In contradiction of the above, 1 Cor. v., 4 and 5, 2 Cor. ii., 7, are referred to as a case of priestly absolution, whereas the case is simply this: A member of the Church of Corinth was living in gross sin, yet the Church took no notice of it. But when St. Paul heard of it, he wrote strongly reproving them for their laxity in allowing it. Then he told them that when they were come together (observe that it was not to be the act of any one man) they ought to expel him, till he came to a better mind and put away his sin. This action of the Church had its desired effect. The man became truly penitent. But the Church, having been reproved for having allowed him to remain in the Church, appears to have been afraid of receiving him again. Therefore the Apostle wrote again, that they ought now to receive him: "Sufficient to such a man is the punishment, *which was inflicted of many*. So that contrariwise ye ought to forgive him . . . wherefore I beseech you that ye would confirm your love to-

wards him.''' What has all this to do with confession to a priest or with priestly absolution? It was an example of the rule, which the Apostle (1 Cor. v., 12 and 13) reminded the Corinthians that they knew, or ought to have known, that, though they had nothing to do with outsiders, it was their duty, that is, it was the duty of the Church, not of any individual, to deal with all such cases within the Church. And such continued to be the custom after the time of the Apostles. But various changes were from time to time introduced, till at last confession to a priest was substituted for the primitive rule.

So the confessional was established which is full of abominations. No doubt there are many pure-minded and honourable priests who would not think of abusing the power which the confessional puts into their hands; yet priests are men, not always good men, nor are they always judicious. As it is required, that penitents make a full confession (to omit any sin knowingly vitiates the whole confession), and as the amount of guilt of any act can only be understood by knowing the thoughts which led to the act, and as there are many sins of the heart which are not outwardly manifested, all these must be confessed to the priest. Is it possible that the priest's mind can be the depository of all the evil and impure thoughts of others without being tainted thereby? Is there no danger of a female's sense of modesty being blunted by recounting these things to a man? Then it is directed that, if any felt a difficulty in making confession through a feeling of modesty, the priest may help them by asking questions. What a wide door is hereby opened for

the suggestion of evil! And as in every duty the right thing to do is to overcome, or get rid of every difficulty to the performance of the duty, so, if confession to a priest is a duty, but a feeling of modesty is a difficulty, the proper thing would be, "GET RID OF MODESTY." No writings have been so much lauded by Popes, Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops of modern days as those of Liguori. One of his works is of such a disgustingly filthy nature that no publisher dare publish a translation of it in any country in Europe, for he would be prosecuted and imprisoned for doing so. Yet that work is the textbook for the education of priests for the confessional in Italy. Whether it is ever used in England or Ireland I know not; yet, if it is a proper thing in Italy, the seat of the Pope, one would suppose that the Roman Catholic Church could not object to it in this country. Many may perhaps remember the feeling of indignation which was aroused some years ago by the exposure in the House of Lords of the book, "The Priest in Absolution," used by Ritualists, translated from a Roman Catholic work.* Unfortunately the impression has almost, if not entirely, died away; for men soon forget what does not immediately affect themselves personally, regardless of the fact that it may be the ruin of their children or their grandchildren. The Rev. Jeremiah Crowley, a Roman Catholic priest, living at Chicago, with the highest personal character from Roman Catholic Cardinals and Bishops, has lately written a book in which he says: "Scores of fathers have told me within the past few years, that they

* It was printed by the secret Romanising Society S.S.C., exclusively for the use of the members in the confessional.

were afraid to permit their children (particularly their daughters) to go to confession, as they felt that they ran great hazard of being ruined. The truth compels me to say, that their fears are well founded. To send a pure young girl to confession to an impure priest is worse than exposing her to smallpox."

At a ruridecanal meeting I once heard a Ritualist defend the practice of asking questions in the confessional by the argument, "that as a doctor ought to inquire into all the symptoms of a disease before prescribing the remedy, so it is necessary for a priest to know all the circumstances of a case before he can properly deal with it." And this was applauded by others present. But I replied that, if a doctor had only one remedy for all diseases, he might apply that remedy without asking any question; so, as the Scriptures acknowledge only one remedy for sin (Acts xiii., 38 and 39), the minister of the Gospel can apply that remedy without enquiring into particulars, which none but God can understand (Rev. ii., 23; Jer. xvii., 9 and 10). Strange that anyone could believe that God has appointed men to do what none but Himself can do! Yet the "priest," who cannot understand his own sins, sits in the place of God (2 Thess. ii., 4) to judge another man, who can neither understand nor explain his sins to him; and then, having decided according to his own judgment what the man who has made the confession must do to atone for his sins, pronounces absolution! And the ease with which the absolution is pronounced *depends entirely upon the character, temper, and disposition of the priest*. Yet of its efficacy I read in "What every Christian must know and do," page 19: "Remember that in the

moment, when the priest says over you the great words of pardon and absolution, your sins are forgiven, the pains of Hell (not the pains of purgatory) are taken away, your soul is made bright and beautiful like an angel of God, and the Kingdom of Heaven is yours." Is it possible that God could give you a more perfect pardon? One who had been a member of the Church of Rome told me that the confessional had been to him an encouragement to sin, for if he wished to do what his conscience told him was wrong, he silenced his conscience with "Never mind, I can easily get rid of the sin in the confessional." *He had faith in the priest's absolution.* I have on different occasions seen it asserted that they who frequent the confessional are greatly comforted thereby. Very likely it is a great comfort to get rid of sin at so cheap a rate! And so thought the man just quoted, and therefore *sinning was made easy.*

If fasting and punishing the body had any tendency to promote holiness, our Lord would doubtless have so taught His Disciples, but He evidently taught the contrary. They had as much need of fasting and doing penance as we have, but He never required anything of the kind. He regarded the custom of stated times of fasting as wrong. When asked (Matt. ix., 14) why His Disciples did not fast, He replied: "Can the children of the bridechamber mourn as long as the bridegroom is with them? But the days will come when the bridegroom shall be taken from them, and then shall they fast." From this He evidently connected fasting with mourning. To fast, therefore, without a cause He regarded as

something worse than useless. He compared it with putting new wine into old skins, which would result in the loss of both the wine and the skins. Such fasting is a work of supererogation tending to foster the idea that we have done something meritorious (St. Luke xviii., 12). As long as He was with His Disciples they could not mourn, therefore they had no cause to fast, but when He was taken from them and crucified, they had sorrow enough, but that sorrow by His resurrection was turned into joy, a joy which no man could take from them (John xvi., 19-22). Therefore the Apostles continually exhorted believers to rejoice. "Rejoice in the Lord always." But *never once did they suggest confession to a priest, or the necessity of fasting or of doing penance.* Having fixed days for fasting is not only contrary to Scripture, but also contrary to reason; it is equivalent to saying, "*I will not be sorry for my sin to-day, but to-morrow.*"

The Romish doctrine of penance was not condemned for the simple reason that it was not known. But doing penance has not only no sanction in the Bible, but *in principle* is actually condemned. St. Paul frequently speaks of Christians as those who live by the faith of Jesus, as having died and risen again with Him (Col. ii., 12; iii., 1). To these he writes (Col. ii., 20-23): "Wherefore if ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye SUBJECT TO ORDINANCES (Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using) AFTER THE COMMANDMENTS AND DOCTRINES OF MEN? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will wor-

ship and humility (a self-chosen worship and humility; see verse 18) and punishing (Romish version, not sparing) the body, not of any value against gratifying the flesh," that is, gratifying man's corrupt nature (Rom. viii., 5-8). This language plainly condemns the idea that sin can be atoned for, or the soul benefited, or holiness attained by punishing the body. The passage also plainly shows that the practice of fasting and mortifying the body, which at that time prevailed in the East for the sake of attaining holiness, was creeping into the Church. But St. Paul's condemnation of it did not stop the evil, for it continued to increase till in the Church of Rome doing penance and self-torture were generally regarded as the chief or sole means of getting rid of sin and attaining holiness. And of *many* of the canonised saints it may be said, that their claim to saintship rested solely on the amount of bodily torture to which they voluntarily submitted; just as in India, *for the same reason*, the Fakirs are regarded by others and by themselves as holy men, though there is nothing of holiness about them or in them. But St. Paul's words signify that this "not sparing the body" in the Church is practically a turning away from full salvation through union with Christ, having "died with Christ." May we not therefore say, if ye trust to such things, "Christ will profit you nothing"? (Gal. v., 2). Christ will not be a half-Saviour (see Col. ii., 10). Rom. v., 1: "Therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." If, then, we have peace with God, what need can there be of penance?

CHAPTER VIII.

REPENTANCE—*μετάνοια*.

THIS unprofitable penance is made in the Romish translation of the New Testament the substitute of a duty, which is absolutely necessary for salvation. One of the most important words in the New Testament is *μετάνοια*.

The Romish explanation of this word, given in a note on Matthew iii., 2, is: "Do penance, *Pœnitentiam* agite, *μετανοείτε*, which word, according to the use of the Scriptures and of the Holy Fathers, does not only signify repentance and amendment of life, but also punishing past sins by fasting and such like penitential exercises." When the Apostles wrote and spoke, they intended that they, to whom the words were addressed, should understand what was meant. Now, no one in the time of the Apostles, and for a long time after that, whether Jew, heathen, or Christian, ever thought of interpreting *μετάνοια* in the way suggested. The Pharisees fasted twice a week, but no one ever dreamed of calling that *μετάνοια*. The practice of punishing the body was gradually introduced and spread in the Church. Afterwards, the signification of the word was changed to suit the practice, just as the word *Presbyter*, which, in the time of the Apostles, never meant anything but an elder, through corrupt teaching and confounding the

ministers of the New Testament with those of the Old, entirely lost its proper signification of Elder, and was assumed to be the same as *ιερεὺς*, or the Latin *sacerdos* (page 112), one who offered a sacrifice. The change in the interpretation of *μετάνοια* began by wrongly translating it by the Latin *pœnitentia*, regret or sorrow for sin. But I may say that even *pœnitentia* never in the slightest degree meant punishing the body, till the practice rendered it necessary to give it a new meaning. But *μετάνοια* had absolutely nothing to do with either joy or sorrow or penance. Its true and simple signification is "an afterthought," or "a change of mind." Lactantius, the most correct of Latin writers in the early Church, and therefore called the Christian Cicero, gives "*resipiscentia*," "a change of mind," as the correct interpretation of *μετάνοια*. In the authorised English translation it is always rendered by repentance. And if we consider the origin of this word it is a correct translation. To repent is derived from the Latin "*rependo*," which signifies "to weigh again." So applied to the mind it means to consider and weigh again the evidence and circumstances of the case, and therefore rightly signifies "an afterthought," or "a change of mind." But it is now almost always understood in the wrong and unscriptural sense of *sorrow* for wrong-doing.

As the Scriptures attach so much importance to this word, it is evident that it could not be satisfied with a mere superficial change of mind, but it is a change which influences the life and conduct, or A TRUE CONVERSION, so that, if it be true that (Prov.

xxiii., 7) "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he," the man, who has passed through this change, has become another man, or in the figurative language of Scripture he is born again, he is a new creature. An examination into the use of the word will fully prove this, and show how the Church of Rome hides this all-important truth and substitutes penance in its place. In Heb. xii., 17, we are told that Esau "found no place of repentance *though he sought it carefully with tears*," that is, he could not change his father's mind. 2 Tim. ii., 25: "If God will give them repentance to the acknowledging of the truth," that is, a change of mind from believing what is false to believing what is true. Here, as also in Acts v., 31, xi., 18, this change of mind is the gift of God, as the effect of faith in the blood of Christ (Heb. vi., 6). In all these places the Romish version gives "repentance," but, as that is their translation of the Vulgate "*pœnitentia*," it could not express the meaning of the Apostle, it could only signify regret or sorrow for sin, but the Greek word to express this is not *μεάνοια*, but *μεταμέλησις*. So the repentance of Judas in Matt. xxvii., 3., is expressed by *μεταμεγηθείς* not *μετανοήσας*. His regret, his sorrow, was great, but there was no *μεάνοια*, no change of mind or of heart, *no conversion*. He regretted the one act that he had done.

In the following passages the Romish version substitutes penance for this change of heart. In Acts xvii., 30, St. Paul told the Athenians that God had till then suffered all nations to worship their false gods, but "now commands all men everywhere to repent," that is, to renounce their idolatries

H

and accept the Gospel. But penance could never mean that which God required. Again, the object of John the Baptist's preaching in preparing the way of Christ was to produce a complete reformation *in the hearts and minds* of the people (*μετάνοιαν*) (Matt. iii., 8-11). In every passage where this is mentioned it is called repentance (Romish version, penance). Is it possible that such reformation and penance could be the same thing? Penance is made the one thing necessary for Salvation. Thus, (2 Peter iii., 9), Romish version, "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should return to penance." Luke xiii., 3 and 5: "Except ye do penance, ye shall all likewise perish." Matt. xi., 20: Chorazin and Bethsaida are condemned because they had not done penance. In these and other passages, doing penance is the "*sine qua non*" of Salvation. Those who "do penance" are saved, those who do not, perish, whereas in every case the word in the original signifies a change of mind, or *conversion*.

I will refer but to one more example (Acts xx., 21), where St. Paul says that he had kept back nothing that was profitable, testifying to Jews and Greeks, that is, to all the world, "repentance (*μετάνοιαν*) towards God and faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ." This is St. Paul's summary of the Christian religion. Repentance towards God, or turning to God with the heart and faith in Jesus. These are not two duties, but one, for they are inseparable. You cannot turn to God except through faith in Jesus (John xiv., 6), nor can you have saving faith in Jesus without turning to God in the heart (St.

John xii., 44 and 45) (what doing penance *towards* God can mean I know not). Jesus "died to bring us to God." And He Himself said, "No man can come to the Father but by me." Of the urgency with which Paul pressed this all-important duty of "repentance towards God" (see 2 Cor. v., 19 and 20), "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them, and hath committed unto us the word of reconciliation (that is, the duty of preaching this reconciliation). Now, then, we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us, we pray you in Christ's stead, be ye reconciled to God." But this all-important word which expresses this change of mind and turning to God the Romish translation perverts into "doing penance." Sorrow for sin is not the change, though it may lead to it. This is beautifully expressed in 2 Cor. vii., 10. There are two words in it which the authorised English version does not rightly distinguish "repentance," and "not to be repented of." The most correct translation is, "Godly sorrow worketh (μετάνοιαν) a change of mind (ἀμεταμέλητον) not to be regretted unto salvation, but the sorrow of the world worketh death." In this verse the Romish translation is altogether wrong. Of course, as usual, "penance" is substituted for the change, or conversion, and the signification of the Greek word μετάνοια is entirely lost. In Acts ii., 38, we have an illustration of this sorrow leading to μετάνοια, conversion. The people were pricked in the heart, convinced of sin with sorrow of heart, and cried, "What shall we do?" Peter replied μετάνοήσατε, "Be

converted and be baptised.” As you rejected Jesus you must now receive Him as your Saviour. Three thousand believed, and the same day were baptised. There was no doing of penance as the Romish translation of *μετανοήσατε* suggested. But the result of the change WAS JOY in the acceptance of a free and full salvation.

CHAPTER IX.

THE SACRAMENT OF BAPTISM.

BAPTISM AND CIRCUMCISION.

THE Church of Rome teaches that Baptism takes away original sin, and thereby confers a new nature; that it is inseparably joined to, or imparts the gift of, the Holy Ghost in regeneration. This is so contrary to what has just been shown of the meaning and effect of repentance (*μετάνοια*), that this would seem the fittest place for examining this subject. Since the fall of man, human nature has always been the same, needing the same regeneration. Circumcision was the rite of admission into the Old Covenant; baptism is the rite of admission into the New Covenant. But circumcision and baptism, though differing from each other in form, had exactly the same signification, namely, cleansing the heart from sin. Thus (Deut. xxx., 6), God said, "I will circumcise thy heart," etc. So (Matt. iii., 11) John the Baptist said that Christ would "baptise with the Holy Ghost." But of circumcision it is clearly stated, both in the Old Testament (Jer. ix., 26) and New Testament (Rom. ii., 29), that the sign and the thing signified were not united. Therefore, by analogy, unless there was plain evidence to the contrary, we might certainly conclude that in baptism the sign and the thing signified are

not united; in other words, baptism does not confer regeneration. That both are to be regarded alike in this respect may also be concluded from the fact that St. Paul joins them together (though circumcision was abolished; Gal. v., 2-6), and says that the true Christian has all that is signified by them (Col. ii., 10-12). "Circumcised with the circumcision made without hands . . . buried with Him in baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him through the faith of the operation of God." By our being united to Christ by faith, His death and resurrection are reckoned as ours (2 Cor. v., 14, Gal. ii., 20). But the faith which secures this blessing, whether represented by circumcision or baptism, is the work of the Spirit (Eph. ii., 8). But as the Jews thought that the rite of circumcision conveyed the blessing signified by it, so the Church of Rome regards baptism. It is the religion of human nature to rest in mere outward performance, as if that would secure the blessing. Here let us consider the supposed proofs that regeneration takes place in baptism.

First, our Lord's words (John iii., 5): "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter the Kingdom of God." But in these words there is no reference to baptism. Nicodemus had come to Jesus for instruction; Jesus at once pointed out what was necessary for salvation, namely, to be born again. Nicodemus thought only of a natural birth, and asked how this could possibly be repeated. *Then it was* that Jesus replied by what ought to have been to him a sufficient explanation: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit,"

etc., adding that if the natural birth could be repeated, it would only repeat the necessity for the spiritual birth; that the Spirit in regeneration works in a way that we cannot understand, though we may observe the result. Nicodemus replied: "How can these things be?" Jesus said: "Art thou a Master (ὁ διδασκαλος, the teacher) of Israel and knowest not these things?" Now, if there were any reference to Christian baptism, how could Nicodemus, as the teacher of Israel, have known anything about it? But he ought to have understood what was meant by being "born of water and of the Spirit," for, as the teacher of Israel, he ought to have understood (Ezek. xxxvi., 25 and 26): "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you; and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh." Here is, beyond all question, a true regeneration, and that under the figure of sprinkling water as an emblem of purification. But Jesus did not leave Nicodemus in doubt as to the way regeneration is accomplished, that it is BY FAITH, for He added (verses 14 and 15): "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." Therefore *he who believes has been born again*. The passage therefore condemns the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.

1 Peter iii., 21: "The like figure to which baptism

doth also save you, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the interrogation of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." But so far from this teaching baptismal regeneration, it teaches the very contrary, for baptism is called a figure of representation, that is, a representation of that which saves us. It is the same word as the Apostle uses in Heb. ix., 24: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, the figure of the true, but into Heaven itself." So the rite of baptism no more saves us than the Jewish high priest went to Heaven every year, when he entered within the vail (Heb. ix., 7 and 8). In fact, that which saves is immediately added. It is not the cleansing with water, but that which is represented by it, the cleansing of the heart, "the interrogation of a good conscience towards God by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (R.V.)

The Christian is taught to regard the death and resurrection of Jesus as if he himself had died and risen again, since Jesus Christ was his substitute. *And the resurrection was the proof that the whole debt was paid.* Therefore St. Peter added: "Forasmuch then as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves with the same mind (that is, consider that you have yourselves suffered with Christ), for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin, that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God." So (Col. ii., 20): "If ye died (*ἀπεθάνατε*) with Christ (iii., 1). If ye then be risen with Christ, set your affections on things above." See Rom. vi., 2: "How shall we,

who died (*ἀπεθάνομεν*) unto sin, live any longer therein?" And verse 11: "Reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin but alive unto God through Jesus Christ our Lord." But it would be impossible for a man with a good conscience towards God to reckon himself dead unto sin, whilst willingly living in sin. And this is exactly what St. Peter meant that baptism teaches. It represents and shows the necessity of change of heart, but does not give it. THE REPRESENTATION OF A THING CANNOT BE THE THING REPRESENTED.

There are also several passages in which water is mentioned as a sign of cleansing; these are also quoted as proving baptismal regeneration. Thus (Titus iii., 5) God, "according to His mercy, saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," is supposed to teach the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But there is, in fact, no reference to baptism. It may be observed that the washing and the regeneration, or renewing of the Holy Ghost, are equally the work of God, both, in fact, being the same thing. But the expression "washing" signifies that regeneration by the Holy Spirit which is a purifying of the heart; but God does not employ water to accomplish this. In Matt. iii., 11, true Christian baptism is said to be by the Holy Ghost *and fire*. The language of Titus iii., 5, exactly corresponds with Ezekiel before quoted: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you . . . A new heart will I give you," etc. Very similar is Heb. x., 22: "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience and our bodies washed with pure

water." And in Eph. v., 26, we read that "Christ gave Himself for the Church, that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word," that is, *by our believing the word*, as Jesus said (John xvii., 17), "Sanctify them through thy truth, thy word is truth." We can be sanctified by the word of God only by believing it, and living according to it. In each of these passages water is mentioned simply AS AN EMBLEM of purifying. But in not one of them is the rite of baptism alluded to as a means of cleansing. In each case *water is the emblem of the Holy Spirit, as fire is in Matt. iii., 11.*

Now that regeneration is in no way connected with baptism there is abundant proof. In 2 Peter i., 4, we are told that we become partakers of the divine nature by believing God's promises. In 1 Peter i., 3, we read that God "hath begotten us again unto a lively hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." And verse 23, "being born again not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God." So in Gal. iii., 26, "Ye are children of God by faith in Christ Jesus." Such passages might be multiplied almost indefinitely. In John i., 12, we read that, to those who believe in Jesus He gives the right to become sons of God. This has nothing to do with baptism. Then it is added, "Which were born, not of blood, nor of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." But if baptismal regeneration were true, this would be false; for man not only determines who is to perform the rite, but also the time and place and all the attendant circumstances. It would therefore be EXACTLY ACCORDING TO THE WILL OF MAN. Further, our Lord said (John

vi., 53), "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Therefore he who is baptised has no spiritual life in him, that is, he is not regenerate till he does what our Lord here states to be necessary (see pages 129 and 131).

Finally, "By their fruits ye shall know them." Peter said that Simon of Samaria, though baptised, "had neither part nor lot in the matter," that is, he was not regenerate. And there are multitudes who have been baptised who have never shown the slightest signs of having been regenerate, and therefore "have neither part nor lot in the matter."

The Church of Rome evidently rests upon the mere outward performance of the rite. Now, is it not exceedingly dangerous to the souls of men to tell them that they are regenerate, when they have only received that which simply tells them of their need of regeneration? And is not that danger greatly increased when rites and ceremonies and outward performances are added, as if the mere performances could secure a blessing? For example, I suppose that the Mass is the most solemn and sacred service of the Church of Rome, yet I read ("What every Christian must believe and do," page 21), "It is a mortal sin to play or talk, etc., during a great part of a Mass, so that you cannot attend to it" ("a great part" leaves a wide door open). "During Mass you may read in your book, or say the beads, or your penance, or any other prayer," etc. This seems to say that your mind may be occupied with something which has no connection with the Mass. Again, "He who is asleep

does not hear Mass, but he who is troubled with sleepiness hears Mass if he can give some attention to it." This seems to imply that it is enough if he is sufficiently awake during some part of the service to know what the priest is doing! If so little attention can be enough for the most solemn of all services, can more be required for the less? But can such be acceptable to God, who requires a whole-hearted service? Again, the rosary (saying the beads as above) looks very much like a device for setting our Lord's words aside (Matt. vi., 7). "When ye pray, use not vain repetitions as the heathen do, for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." The beads enable one, who uses them, to tell how many "Pater nosters" or "Hail Marys" he has said, whilst his thoughts have really been engaged in something else. He has repeated the prayer so many times and that is enough! Such things quite agree with the idea that in baptism the sign and the thing signified are inseparably united. Nothing more is required than the performance, and God is bound to give the blessing!

CHAPTER X.

“THE SACRAMENT OF HOLY ORDERS AND OF HOLY EUCHARIST.”

“THE Sacrament of Holy Orders,” and “the Sacrament of Holy Eucharist,” or of “the Mass.” These two sacraments ought to be taken together. They stand and fall together. The Romish priest is ordained to offer the sacrifice of the Mass. In this matter the Church of Rome has gone very far from the teaching of God’s word.

To understand this fully it is necessary to examine the treatment of two words in very frequent use in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, “Hiereus” and “Presbyteros.” These words have absolutely no connection with each other in origin or signification. “Hiereus” signified the office held by Aaron and his descendants, and also our Lord (Heb. v., 10). Presbyter originally signified “an elder” with reference to age, but in the New Testament it signified the position to which a man was elected without any reference to age. Just as at Rome a Senator was a member of the Senate or Council of Elders, without any qualification of age, and this use of the word is exactly the case at the present time in America. So our word Alderman, a member of a city or town council, comes from the Anglo-Saxon, and was equal to “an elder,” “elderman,” but he is elected

without any reference to age. So Presbyter signified a member of the council. In Jerusalem it signified a member of the great council of the nation. The Jews had also Presbyters in every town where there was a synagogue correctly translated in the A.V. of the New Testament by "elders." Now, when the Apostles founded the various Churches, it was necessary that there should be some sort of government, and therefore some sort of governing body, and they naturally adopted that, with which they were acquainted, and therefore they ordained Presbyters, or elders, in every city or Church, who formed a sort of Church Council. But they differed in no respect from the Jewish elders, who had absolutely nothing to do with the services of the temple, offering sacrifices, etc., which duties were strictly confined to the "hierarchy" alone. If the elders or Presbyters of the Christian Church had differed from those of the Jewish Church it would have been necessary that the difference should have been distinctly stated, for everybody would understand the word in the sense in which it had always been used. The Presbyters were also called "Episcopi" (afterwards shortened to Bishops), overseers. The Epistle to the Philippians is addressed to "the saints which are at Philippi with the Bishops and Deacons." That the Presbyters and Bishops were the same is evident from various passages. Where Bishops are mentioned Presbyters are not mentioned, and *vice versa*. We read of Bishops and Deacons, but never of Bishops and Presbyters, because they were the same. And in Titus i., 5-7, and Acts xx., 17 and 28, it is evident that the terms are

interchangeable. Now, in the Presbytery, or Council of Presbyters, one would naturally be chosen to preside either on account of age, or piety, or influence. And this became the foundation of the distinction between the overseer, or bishop, and the other presbyters. Thus, the three orders of Presbyters, Bishops and Deacons were established, or rather gradually developed. But we have no right to say that this was a divine appointment, since the New Testament gives no authority for it.

Some time after the three orders of ministers in the Church had been recognised, it became a custom to compare them with the three orders of ministers of the Old Covenant (wrongly translated high priest, or chief priest, priests and Levites). If the comparison had stopped here, little harm would have been done. But, as before pointed out, pride was the moving cause of the great Apostasy, and it began to work evil here. As the descendants of Aaron were a kind of sacred caste, brought near unto God, whose privilege it was to offer gifts and sacrifices, and to burn incense before the Lord; through pride and ambition the comparison was continually pushed further, till it was made to appear that Presbyters and the descendants of Aaron held exactly the same office; and therefore as the duties of both *were supposed* to be the same, the same name was used to designate both. Both were called Presbyters, afterwards changed in spelling to Preoster, Prester, Preste, Priest; and the Hebrew name, as well as the New Testament name, of the sacrificing priest was entirely lost. And as our language was formed during the dark ages of cor-

ruption and perversion, we have no word by which we can express the office of the sons of Aaron properly; we can only call them Presbyters or elders; yea, the highest title that we can give our Lord in this respect is, "our great chief Presbyter or elder." Whilst those who, according to the New Testament, ought to be nothing but Presbyters or elders have exalted themselves into a sacred caste, which pretends to have succeeded to the office of our Lord. SURELY THIS MAY WELL BE CALLED A GREAT APOSTASY.

But I would here add another example of the dishonesty of the Church of Rome. That Church professes to follow the Vulgate translation of the Scriptures as their authority. Now, that translation was made before any change had been made in the signification or form of the word Presbyter, consequently, whenever that word occurs in the original language of the New Testament, referring to a minister of the Church, the word Presbyter is retained in the Vulgate. On the other hand, the word "Hiereus" is INVARIABLY translated by the correct Latin equivalent, "Sacerdos." How does the Church of Rome deal with these words "Sacerdos" and "Presbyteros," which have absolutely nothing in common? They treat them as if they were absolutely synonymous, translating them both by the word "*Priest.*" Why? Simply because, if they had followed the Vulgate and made the distinction, they would not have had, even in their own translation of Scripture, the shadow of authority for their "*Priesthood.*" THE VULGATE GIVES NONE.

Though we have not in English a word by which

we can correctly represent the Greek *ιερεὺς*, "hiereus," or its correct Latin translation, "sacerdos," we have what I may call *the shadow of each*, which clearly points out our loss. Thus we have the remains of "hiereus" in "hierarchy," priestly government; of "sacerdos" in "sacerdotal," priestly. But we cannot even attempt to explain "hierarchy" or "sacerdotal" without using the word "priest," which, in the New Testament, never signified anything except "an elder." Romanists and Ritualists take advantage of this loss in our language, which a corrupt Church has inflicted upon us, by using the word *priest* in a wrong sense, and so deceive multitudes.

I have just met with an argument to prove that there are priests in the Church. Because whilst the Israelites were called a kingdom of priests there was at the same time a separate order of priests; therefore, as Christians are called a kingdom of priests, there must, by analogy, be a separate order of priests in the Church. This is plausible but fallacious. The Israelites were indeed called a kingdom of priests *if obedient* (Exod. xix., 6). But if any one of them, who was not of the family of Aaron, dared to perform *any act belonging to the literal priesthood* he was put to death (Num. iii., 10; see also the case of Korah, Num. xvi.).

So in 1 Peter ii., 5 and 9, Christians are called, "a spiritual house, a holy priesthood to offer up spiritual sacrifices," the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, etc., but, by analogy, as in the former case, if anyone presumes to act as a literal priest, to offer a sacrifice, woe be to him (see page 117).

The oneness of the priest and of the sacrifice in the Christian covenant are marked in various ways. For example, by the use of the word *ἐφάπαξ*. *Ἀπαξ* signifies once, but *ἐφάπαξ* signifies (if one might use such an expression) "up to once," and no more, once for all. IT EXCLUDES OR FORBIDS THE IDEA OF A REPETITION. In 1 Cor. xv., 6, St. Paul says that Christ, after His resurrection, was seen by more than 500 brethren at once, this word was used to signify emphatically that the number was not made up by adding together what happened on several occasions, but they all saw him at one and the same time and place. In Heb. vii., 27, the word is used to mark the difference between the Jewish offerings and the offering by Jesus. Their offerings were daily, but the offering of Jesus was once for all, never to be repeated. In Heb. ix., 12, the word is used to mark a contrast. The Jewish high priest entered within the vail in the tabernacle *once every year*. Our great High Priest entered into the Holy Place (Heaven) *once for all*, having obtained eternal redemption for us; there can be no repetition. In Heb. x., 10, the word is again used to mark a contrast. Whilst telling us that it was not possible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sin, and that such sacrifices were offered daily, the Apostle tells us that "we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all," that is, it cannot be offered again. The pretence therefore of offering the body of Christ again in the Mass, or in any other way, is a blasphemous fable, a daring contradiction of God's word. The same

word is also used in the same sense in Rom. vi., 10 (see page 141).

The same truth is also manifested from the fact that Jesus is called "a Priest *for ever* after the order of Melchizedek" (Heb. v., 6). The name and title of Melchizedek, "The king of righteousness and king of peace" (Heb. vii., 2), point to the one offering of Christ which can never be repeated. Rom. iv., 25: "He died for our sins and was raised for our justification," which is our title to Heaven; for (Rom. viii., 30) "whom God justified, them he also glorified." But justification means *being made righteous*. It is the same word in the original. "Therefore (Rom. v., 1), being justified (made righteous) by faith we have peace with God." Thus, through the one offering of Christ once for all (according to the name and title of Melchizedek), we have righteousness and peace, and a title to Heaven.

Again, Melchizedek is set before us as a priest of the Most High God (Heb. vii., 2 and 3), made to be a type and representation of the Son of God by the omission of the beginning and end of his life and of his priesthood. He stands before us as "a priest continually." This signifies that, as Jesus received His Priesthood from no man, so He transmitted His Priesthood to no man, but He Himself continues a Priest for ever, *the only Priest of His Church*, the only Hieres, *not Presbyter*.

In confirmation of the above let us turn to the original language of the New Testament, and, as we have no other word by which we can translate the word "Hieres," we must, OF NECESSITY, suppose that "Priest" is correct. Now, the word

Hiereus (with Archiereus) occurs more than 140 times in the New Testament in reference to the family of Aaron, several times to Melchizedek, twenty times to our Lord, and once to those who offered sacrifice to Jupiter, but it is NOT ONCE applied to any person, or class, or order of persons in the Christian Church, a clear proof that there is no sacrificing priest in the Church of Christ.

In further confirmation of the same, let us turn to a few passages where, if there had been any priest, some traces must, of necessity, be found. In 1 Cor. xii., 28, we read: "God hath set some in the Church (to be) first apostles, secondarily prophets (preachers), thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healing, helps, governments, diversities of tongues." It is not said that He set priests (hiereis) in the Church. But in giving a list, surely the most important would not be omitted, especially if, as the Church of Rome teaches, priests were so important, that a Church could not exist without them. The omission shows that there are no priests.

Again (Eph. iv., 11), Christ "gave some to be apostles, and some prophets (preachers), and some evangelists, and some pastors and teachers." But where are the priests? (hiereis). Yet those that are mentioned were "for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ, etc." Now, if all this could be accomplished without a priest, we may ask, what is the good of priests?

Next, we have two Epistles to Timothy, and one to Titus, in which we read that it was their duty

CENTRAL POINT OF EP. TO HEBREWS. 117

to ordain Presbyters (or Bishops) and Deacons, but they had no commission to ordain priests. Why? Because they were not wanted.

Lastly, we turn to the Epistle to the Hebrews, in which we are told distinctly that there are no priests in the Church of Christ, and reasons are given why there can be none. The contrast is drawn between the Mosaic and the Christian dispensation. In the former there were many priests and many sacrifices; in the latter there is but one Priest, the Lord Jesus Christ, and one sacrifice. It is also definitely stated that the priests of the Old Testament, and their sacrifices, were simply types or shadows of Christ and His sacrifice. The most important, the central point of the whole, is contained in Chapter IX., where we are told, that the entrance of the High Priest in the temple within the vail, on the great day of atonement, was the type of our Lord's entrance into Heaven after offering Himself as a sacrifice for sin. Now, in Lev. xvi., 17, we find this remarkable law, that, when the high priest went within the vail, all other priestly functions ceased, for no one was even allowed in the tabernacle till he came out; the Holy Ghost thus signifying, that when our great High Priest entered within the vail, that is Heaven, there could be no priestly functions in the Church, therefore no priests. And since "He ever liveth to make intercession for us" He has a priesthood which cannot be transferred to any other (Heb. vii., 24-28). Again, there was another law to be particularly observed (Num. iii., 10, xvi., 40). If anyone, who was not of the family of Aaron, presumed to act as a priest, he was to be put to death. If, then,

the Levitical priesthood, which was but typical, and could never really accomplish anything, was so strictly guarded, *how much greater must be the sin of presuming to claim any part of our Lord's Priesthood!* In fact, the Apostles called themselves Apostles, presbyters or elders, preachers, teachers, evangelists, stewards, deacons, or servants, etc., and St. Paul did not hesitate to call himself a worker together with God. But neither he nor any other Apostle ever dared to call himself, or any other member of the Church, a priest. Our Lord's priesthood is *'απαράβατον* (Heb. vii., 24). It cannot pass on to another.

A review of the foregoing evidence, I think, ought to be sufficient to convince any reasonable man that the Scriptures absolutely forbid the existence of a priest in the Church of Christ. And if there can be no priest there can be no sacrifice—no confession to a priest—no priestly absolution. And as the Church of Rome requires a priest for the performance of a sacrament, there can be no sacrament in the Church of Rome. And as the Church teaches that there can be no salvation without a sacrament, there can be no salvation in the Church of Rome. Therefore the first and most important thing for the Church of Rome to do is to prove that Christ ordained priests in His Church. It is not sufficient to say that there must be priests because the Church says that there are priests. But if there ever had been priests in the Church, the law of the Church must have extinguished the succession long ago (pages 21-23).

CHAPTER XI.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

As the Presbyters (now called priests) had assumed to themselves the same office as that of Aaron and of our Lord, an altar and sacrifice became necessary. So the Mass, or the Holy Eucharist, naturally followed.

According to the definition of the Church of Rome, "the Holy Eucharist is the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine." Even in this definition there is a palpable absurdity. "Eucharist" simply signifies "a giving of thanks," but it is absurd to say that our Lord's body either is or represents thanksgiving. The Romish doctrine of the Eucharist is the doctrine of transubstantiation, and this monstrous doctrine is involved in absurdities, contradiction of God's word, and blasphemy. But a great deal of ingenuity has been exercised to prove that it is in accordance with the Scriptures. But it would require very clear evidence to prove that there is any sacrifice at all, after the evidence, that **THERE CAN BE NO PRIEST**, and that the body of Christ was once offered and could never be offered again.

In the first place the doctrine is supposed to rest on our Lord's words (Luke xxii., 19 and 20): "He took bread, and when He had given thanks, He brake it, and gave it to them, saying, This is my

body which is given for you; this do in remembrance of me. And the cup in like manner after supper, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is poured out for you." Every expression in this passage has been used to prove that our Lord was instituting a sacrifice. Even the expression, "Do this," has been turned into "sacrifice this." The word in the original signifies "to make," or "to do," but, like our word "to do," takes many meanings, yet there is never any difficulty in understanding it, because the circumstance, or some word joined to it, definitely fixes its signification. In a few cases in heathen writers it does signify to sacrifice, but that signification depends, not on the verb, but on the word added to it, thus, to make a hecatomb can only signify to sacrifice a hecatomb. Hecatomb gives the meaning to the verb. But there is nothing connected with our Lord's words which could suggest sacrifice.

Next, it has been asserted that "remembrance," *ἀνάμνησις*, ought to be translated "memorial." Thus they would bring in sacrifice by a kind of side door, for the memorial of a sacrifice formed part of the sacrifice. Thus they would have a continuance of Christ's sacrifice. But our Lord said, "Take and eat this," but the memorial of a sacrifice was never eaten but burnt upon the altar (Lev. ii., 2-9; v., 12, etc.). A memorial is not *ἀνάμνησις*, but *μνημόσυνον*.

It is also asserted, that when Jesus took the bread and the cup and gave thanks or blessed them, the change took place, that the bread and wine ceased to be bread and wine, and became the actual body

and blood of Jesus, and the Church of Rome added, "The soul and divinity." This is hardly worth consideration, for we are not told that they were then changed. And what our Lord then did was no more than He did when He broke the five loaves among the five thousand, and the seven loaves among the four thousand. St. Paul also did the same on the evening before the ship was wrecked. He took bread and gave thanks and began to eat, and all in the ship followed his example (Acts xxvii., 35 and 36).

The above arguments are not insisted upon by all Romanists. But the one which is always insisted upon is, that our Lord's words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," must be taken literally. And to place this beyond all doubt, in the English version of the Church of Rome the words are printed in capitals (Rheims Ed., 1582), as if they were unquestionably the most important words in the whole Bible. Let us, then, examine the case, and we shall see in how many points the Romish doctrine and practice departs from Scripture and reason.

I.—When our Lord spake those words, His body was still whole, not a drop of blood had been shed. If, then, the Romish doctrine be correct, Jesus took His own body in His hands and brake it in pieces, whilst His body continued whole and entire! And His body, which was, at the same time, both whole and entire, and broken in pieces, was exactly like our own bodies! Could anything be more absurd? In order to avoid this absurdity, and render it credible, that our Lord's body is really present

in the sacrament, it is said by some, that our Lord's glorified body may exist under conditions of which we can form no conception. That may be true; yet it must be observed, that when Jesus spake these words He had not a glorified, but a natural body, and He spake of a natural body only; and it was a natural, and not a glorified or spiritual body, that He gave up as a sacrifice on the cross. Therefore, if a real presence was to be expected in the sacrament, founded on our Lord's words, it ought to be a real natural body, as that which suffered on the cross! Besides, a body, whether you call it natural, spiritual or glorified, can only exist in one place at the same time.

II.—The Church ought to be consistent. If "This is my body" must be taken literally, so must the next sentence, "This cup is my blood," but how can the cup be the blood? Of course, common sense tells us that the words really referred to that which was in the cup, but that is setting aside the literal; so common sense tells us that the literal must be set aside in "This is my body."

III.—That which was in the cup had never flowed through our Lord's veins, yet, literally, it was that which was in the cup which was to be poured out for sinners (Luke xxii., 20); in this case also the literal must be given up.

IV.—That which the Church of Rome calls a sacrifice consisted (if it was a sacrifice), in fact, of two separate sacrificial acts. It was whilst the Disciples were eating the Paschal lamb and unleavened bread that Jesus took bread and blessed it, etc.; but it was after the supper was ended that He took the cup,

etc. Thus, the two sacrificial acts were perfectly distinct; first, the sacrifice of the body without the blood, and afterwards, the sacrifice of the blood without the body (see Luke xxii., 19 and 20; Matt. xxvi., 26-28. Another Romish absurdity).

V.—There was no sacrifice on that evening, the sacrifice was on the day following. And it is worthy of note that in the Vulgate version, which was made some hundred years before there was any thought of a priest or sacrifice in the Church, whilst the Presbyters were still Presbyters, each of the Gospels, and the Epistle to the Corinthians, represents the sacrifice as still future. Jerome had not the slightest thought that Jesus was then making any offering. And the Church of Rome, in her translation, exactly follows the Vulgate (1 Cor. xi., 24): "This is my body which SHALL BE delivered up for you." Matt. xxvi., 28): He took the cup and said, "This is my blood WHICH SHALL BE shed." But in her practice she ignores her own translation. But it was necessary for the Church of Rome to ignore the Vulgate and her own translation in this matter, for if Jesus did not on that evening offer Himself as a sacrifice, there could be no pretext for saying that their priests offer a sacrifice, for if they do offer a sacrifice they do that which Jesus did not. But they do not what He told His Disciples to do.

VI.—The Church of Rome rightly translates our Lord's words, "Do this," that is, "Do what I am doing," "take bread and brake it, and give to each one a part." But the priests of Rome do nothing of the kind. They take away the broken bread and

substitute a wafer, and withhold the cup altogether from the laity without any substitution, on the pretence that the wafer is the body and blood of Christ. But if that be the case, there could be no need of consecrating the wine.

VII.—We are told in the Gospels that all the Disciples did eat of the bread and all drank of the cup. Perhaps Romanists will say that they all did eat and drink because they were priests. This is not true. When were they ordained priests? The truth is, the Lord's supper was appointed for all members of the Church. This is plainly stated in 1 Cor. x., 16-18: "The cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the blood of Christ? The bread (loaf) which we break, is it not the *communion* of the body of Christ? For *we being many are one loaf, one body, for we are all partakers of that one loaf.*" It is a communion because we all partake of the bread and wine in common, and it signifies our union with Christ and each other. The wafer changes the whole nature and form of the sacrament, for the separate wafers are independent of each other, and could never suggest union, or unity, but separation.

VIII.—The Church of Rome requires that the sacrament shall be taken fasting; no food is to be taken from the midnight before. Therefore evening communion is condemned. But Jesus instituted the communion in the evening, and the bread was eaten during the Paschal feast, and the wine was drunk after the feast (Luke xxii., 19 and 20). And every intimation of the time of the communion in the New Testament is in the evening. And its

proper designation is "the Lord's supper" (1 Cor. xi., 20 and 21).

IX.—As to the manner, our Lord said, "Take and eat." The word "take" is the same as when it is said, "Jesus took bread." The meaning therefore is, that as He took the loaf in His hand, so they were to take that, which He gave them, into their hands in a natural way. But, according to "What every Christian must know and do," the Church of Rome forbids this. The laity are not allowed to touch the wafer. They must shut their eyes, open their mouths, put out their tongues for the priest to put the wafer upon it; then they are to shut their mouths and swallow it. But if it stops on the roof of the mouth, even in that case they are not to remove it with the hand, but with the tongue! If it had been the definite purpose of the Church of Rome to make as many changes from our Lord's appointments as possible, it could not have succeeded better, whereas what Jesus said and did were simple and very intelligible.

X.—The sign or representation of anything is constantly called by the name of or said to be the thing represented. So St. Augustine interpreted the words, "This is my body." Thus in a work, in which he is proving to the Manichœans, that the words, "The blood is the life" (Deut. xii., 23), which they took literally, "must be interpreted figuratively." As an illustration of his argument, he said, "A thing which is a sign is accustomed to be called by the name of the thing which it signifies; as it is written, 'The seven ears are seven years'!" For he did not say, "they signify seven years," and

"the seven kine are seven years," and many things of this kind. Hence, there is that which is said, "The rock was Christ," but he did not say, "The rock signified Christ," etc. Augustine gave other examples of this mode of speaking, he might have given some hundreds, but what especially concerns our present subject is, that he quotes these words of Jesus as an example, for he said, "Our Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is my body, when He gave a sign of His body.' " Now the real weight of this quotation from Augustine lies in this, that he not only himself believed that the words of Jesus are to be taken figuratively, but he had not the slightest idea that anybody could take them literally, *not even the Manichæans*, who interpreted "The blood is the life" literally; for, if the words of Jesus could have been interpreted literally, they would have told strongly against His own argument. From this it is evident that the doctrine of transubstantiation was not known in the time of Augustine. No doubt figurative language may be found in some of the writings of the Fathers before Augustine's time, as in the Gospels, and it is not surprising that they, who now insist upon taking our Lord's words in a literal sense, should take such language literally, when found in the Fathers. But Augustine's arguments apply to those passages as well as to the words in the Gospels; they were ALWAYS taken figuratively.

XI.—Of course, the Church of Rome represents the supposed change of bread into the body of Christ as a *miracle*, and requires us to believe it on the testimony of the Church, though it is contrary

to the testimony of all our senses, faculties and reason. Jesus appealed to *His miracles* as evidences of the truth of what He taught. But in doing this He appealed to the testimony of the people's senses and reason (John x., 25 and 37 and 38). And He also declared that they would be condemned for not acting according to the testimony of their senses (John xv., 24). But the Church of Rome condemns, and has murdered millions of human beings for believing the testimony of their senses. And this is an exact illustration of the way that the teaching of Jesus continually differs from the teaching of the Church of Rome. And the Apostle Paul, speaking of this same sacrament (1 Cor. x., 15), says, "I speak as unto wise men, judge ye what I say," which signifies that there is nothing in that sacrament of which our senses are incapable of forming a right judgment.

CHAPTER XII.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

BUT as long as any passage of Scripture supposed to be in favour of transubstantiation remains unanswered, that will be regarded as sufficient in spite of the clearest evidence to the contrary, therefore it may be needful to deal with one or two passages. "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life" (John vi., 53 and 54). This is by Romanists supposed to refer to the sacrament, and to be understood literally. But it could not refer to the sacrament, for that was not yet instituted. It is true that Jesus knew that it would be instituted, but those, to whom the words were addressed, could have known nothing about it; yet it was expected that they ought to understand what was said. Next, if the words referred to the sacrament it would follow (according to Romish interpretation) that all who failed to take the sacrament must perish, whatever their faith and life might be; and all who received the sacrament would be saved, whatever their life and faith, or want of faith, might be, for it would be taking great liberty with language to interpret part of a sentence literally and the rest figuratively. Surely this is sufficient to prove that the words cannot refer to the sacrament.

What, then, is the meaning of John vi., 53? First, I would observe that no words were so frequently used figuratively as hungering and thirsting, eating and drinking (Jer. xv., 16): "Thy words were found and I did eat them; and Thy word was unto me the joy and rejoicing of my heart." Isaiah lv., 1 and 2: "Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the water . . . hearken diligently unto me and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness." The eating and drinking here simply means a joyful acceptance of the promised Saviour. That John vi., 53, is in like manner to be understood figuratively will be abundantly manifest by examining the context. It forms part of a conversation of Jesus with many who had just been eating of the five barley loaves. There is a remarkable similarity between that and the conversation in chapter iv. with the Samaritan woman at the well. In this case, everlasting life was promised under the emblem of water, suggested by the well. In the other case, the same blessing was promised under the emblem of bread, suggested by the barley loaves. Jesus knew that all the people cared about was the satisfying their bodily appetites, and therefore He told them that their most important duty was to "work for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life," which He would give unto them (verses 26 and 27).

Then they said unto Him (verses 28 and 29), "What shall we do, that we might work the work of God?" Jesus answered and said unto them, "This is the work of God, that ye *believe* on Him whom He hath sent." I need not go through the

K

chapter, the sentence just quoted clearly proves that the eating of this food of everlasting life is simply a matter of faith. But the people continued to find difficulties instead of accepting Christ's word. So He again and again, in different ways, asserted the same thing. I need only to quote verse 35, "Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life. *He that cometh unto me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*" And, again (verse 47), "Verily, verily I say unto you, *he that believeth on me hath everlasting life.*" This cannot be figurative language, but is the statement of a plain truth. Therefore, when He said, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you," the meaning is exactly the same as in verse 47, otherwise there would be a flat contradiction. It simply means, that we can have no spiritual life till we receive Christ in our hearts *by faith*. In verse 57 Jesus said, "As the living Father sent me into the world, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me even he shall live by me." How did Jesus live by the Father? *Not by eating*, but by constant communion with Him, and doing His will. Thus, in John iv., 34, Jesus said, "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, and to finish His work," so the Christian lives by Christ, feeds upon Him by constant communion with Him and doing His will (John xv., 10). In conclusion, Jesus said (verse 63), "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, *the flesh profiteth nothing*; the words that I speak unto you they are spirit, and they are life," that is, they must be understood spiritually.

Here, again, I will refer to a writing of Augustine, in which he gives rules for the interpretation of Scripture. He says, "If a form of speech seems to command a disgraceful thing, or a crime, it is figurative. Then he gives an example. Now, an example, to illustrate or confirm a rule, must be such that it could not be questioned, for if the illustration be questionable, the rule is worthless. The example he gives is, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." To which he adds, "He seems to command a disgraceful thing, or a crime, therefore it is figurative, commanding us to communicate in the suffering of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to treasure up in our memory that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us." Here, again, we may observe that Augustine had no idea that anyone ever did, could, or would, take the words literally. If he had ever heard of such a thing, he would have been careful to give some other illustration.

The Church of Rome also quotes 1 Cor. xi., 27-29, as a proof of the doctrine of transubstantiation. The passage cannot be rightly and fully understood without taking in the context beginning at verse 17. Read the whole passage. Words separated from the context often appear to signify the very opposite to that which was intended. The whole passage is a strong condemnation of the Romish doctrine. But, first, let us consider the words on which the Church of Rome relies, apart from the context.

R.C. version (27th verse): "Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord

unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. (28): But let a man prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice. (29): For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord." Now, if this passage taught that the body of our Lord was actually present in the sacrament, it would condemn every one who partakes of it. For no one can by any one or all his faculties discern our Lord's body in the bread, or R.C. wafer. Observe, this is not a question of faith, but of discerning (see section xi., page 126). Moreover, it would have been far more necessary to discern the blood. In verse 26 the Apostle tells us that the sacrament refers solely to the death of Jesus. And it was the death, represented by the blood, that made the atonement (Heb. ix., 22): "Without shedding of blood is no remission." So 1 John i., 9. It is the blood of Jesus that cleanseth us from all sin. Now, in that verse, the Apostle used the words "eateth and drinketh" twice; why, then, did he not use the corresponding expression, "discern the body AND BLOOD"? The context will answer. But here, I may add, that by withholding the cup from the laity the Church of Rome takes from them the most significant part of the sacrament (see page 260).

But it is necessary to consider what St. Paul actually wrote (verse 29): "He that eateth and drinketh, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, if he discern not the body." The words "unworthily" and "of the Lord" were copied by mistake from the previous verse (according to ancient MSS.).

Also, in verse 34, he used two words, διακρίνω and κρίνω. Both the A.V. and the R.C. version treat them as if there was no difference, but the former signifies to discern, and is rightly so translated by both in verse 29, and therefore verse 31 should be, "But if we would discern ourselves we should not be judged." It is also very important to notice verse 20, R.C. version: "When ye come together . . . it is not now to eat the Lord's supper." The word "now" is not in the original, but was introduced into the Vulgate. But that *translation* signifies that their coming together was not with the object of eating the Lord's supper, but *the context* plainly shows that that WAS their professed object. But if that object had been meant *in this verse*, instead of *ὅνκ ἔστι φαγῆναι*, the grammar would have required *ὅνκ ἔστιν ἵνα φαγῇτε*. The error arose from not observing that *ἔστι* sometimes signifies "is lawful," or "is possible." Both grammar and the context require the latter signification, and it is so translated in the revised version. The word is used in exactly the same sense in Heb. ix., 5, *περί ὧν ὅνκ ἔστιν νῦν λέγειν κατὰ μέρος*, "concerning which things it is now impossible to speak particularly."

Now, let us consider the circumstances. The Greeks had a custom, in which they greatly delighted, of eating and drinking together. In these companies (called "symposia") sometimes each contributed a certain sum, but more frequently each brought his own provisions. The Apostle heard that in the Church of Corinth some were introducing this custom into the Lord's supper, making it

a part of a common symposium feast; therefore he wrote strongly condemning their conduct. After mentioning the divisions caused by it, he said (verses 21 and 22), "When ye come together . . . it is not possible to eat the Lord's supper, for each takes before his own supper, and one is hungry and another is *drunken*." This word expresses Paul's abhorrence of their practice. But why was it impossible for them to eat the Lord's supper if they had been moderate in their eating and drinking? Because the Lord's supper is a communion (x., 16), a sign and pledge of their union with each other and with the Lord; but what they were doing could only mean and cause disunion, divisions. Therefore he indignantly asks (verse 22), "What? Have ye not houses to eat and drink in? or despise ye the Church of God and put to shame them that have nothing? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." Here, then, was their sin, treating other members, most of whom were poor and some slaves, with contempt, and thereby despising the Church of God. "*The Church which is the body of Christ*" (Eph. i., 22 and 23, and 1 Cor. xii., 27), R.C. version: "Ye are the body of Christ and members of member," that is, "members of each other." For (x., 17) "we being many are one loaf, ONE BODY, for we all partake of the one loaf." This is the great lesson of the Lord's supper, but this the Mass utterly ignores. (In the last quoted verse "for" is omitted in "for we all," and the verse is in other respects imperfectly translated in the R.C. Bible.)

The Apostle next (verses 23-25) reminded them of what he had taught them, ending with our Lord's

words, "Do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance (R.C. version, in commemoration) of me." Now, these words imply absence, for it would be absurd to talk of doing anything in remembrance, or commemoration, of one who is bodily present. Then he added (verse 26), "For as oft as ye eat this bread (observe, still bread whilst being eaten) and drink the cup, ye show (proclaim) the Lord's death till He come." "*Till He come*" also implies absence, therefore there can be no bodily presence of our Lord in the Sacrament.

Then (verse 27) he again mentions their conduct with the consequence. "Therefore, whosoever shall eat the bread or drink the cup of the Lord unworthily (that is, in an unworthy manner, as they were doing, professedly commemorating the death of Jesus, whilst they treated with disrespect the appointed symbols which spoke of that death) shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Then he showed *how the sin was to be avoided* (verse 28): "But let a man prove himself, *and* so let him eat of the bread and drink of the cup." And, again (verse 31), "For if we would discern ourselves we should not be judged." Now, by comparing verse 29 with verse 31, it is evident that discerning the body and discerning ourselves is the same thing, because he who does not discern the body is condemned, yet if he discerns himself he is not condemned. And this must be so, because if a man proves himself, and discerns himself to be a member of the body, he must of necessity discern the body of which he is a member. And if he really recognised what it is to be a member of Christ's body, he could not

possibly act as those members of the Church of Corinth were acting. Read xii., 12-27. Thus the whole passage proves, over and over again, that there can be no bodily presence of our Lord in the Sacrament.

There are a few other passages which Romanists quote to prove the doctrine of the Mass. Thus, in 1 Cor. x., 21, they assume that "the table of the Lord" means "the Altar," because the Apostle calls the idolatrous feast of the heathen "the table of demons." He was warning Christians against idolatry. He told them to judge as wise men, that that of which they partook in the Lord's supper was simply bread and wine, signifying their union with each other and the Lord. When the heathen offered a sacrifice they made a feast of it, therefore that feast might be called either partaking of the altar, or of the table of demons. But, as Christians have no altar, the Apostle made use of the latter term, making one expression apply to both. "Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table and the table of demons." Ye cannot maintain your Christian union, and join in idolatrous feasts. In Minucius Felix (third century), a heathen is represented as asking, "Why is it that you Christians have no altars?" The answer given is, "The sacrifice which God accepts is a good spirit, and a pure mind, and a guiltless conscience. These are our sacrifices, these are our offerings to God."

Heb. xiii., 10, is also quoted: "We have an altar" to prove the doctrine of the Mass. But if it referred to the Mass it would be "We have altars." Besides, such teaching would flatly contradict all that

is said in chapters ix. and x. The context shows that the expression referred to the cross. The Apostle, speaking to those Jews who still clung to the ceremonial law, simply said that they who rely upon types and shadows have no right to the blessing purchased by the one true sacrifice on the cross. "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle" (see context, verses 10-13, and page 138).

Romanists also quote Mal. i., 11: "In every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering," and say that the pure offering is the Mass. But the pure offering (Minchah, meat offering) had no connection with expiation. Tertullian, the first of the Latin Fathers, explains it as "giving glory, blessing, praise, and hymns." And, again, as "heartly prayer from a pure heart."

It has been shown that the passages quoted to prove the Romish doctrine of transubstantiation, when taken with the context, prove the very contrary. Add to this, as before proved, that there can be no sacrificing Priests in the Church of Christ. But, in addition to the arguments before given, there are some which will hardly admit of a reply.

I.—If the Apostle had stated such a doctrine it would have caused unbounded astonishment. Such a thing as bread being turned into human flesh had never been heard of since the world began. Such a doctrine could not have been easily accepted. Every member of the Church, and everyone who thought of becoming a member, would have asked how such a thing could be? Why it was not evident to the

senses ? with many other difficulties ; and the Apostles *would have been compelled to be continually answering all the difficulties*. Yet the Church of Rome would have us believe that multitudes, both of Jews and Gentiles, accepted this most extraordinary of all doctrines, not only without asking a single question about it, but without a single plain statement of the doctrine set before them ! Such a reception of such a doctrine would, in itself, have been a miracle, and such a miracle as would most correctly be called an impossibility.

II.—Our Lord offered Himself as a sin-offering, a sacrifice for the sins of the world. In the Old Testament it is repeated over and over again (see Exod. xxix., 14), that no part of a sin-offering must be eaten, the whole was to be burnt with fire. And in Heb. xiii., 11 and 12, it is pointed out that this law had especial reference to Jesus as the sin-offering. How, then, could Jesus possibly have commanded that His body should be eaten ? He said Himself that He came not to destroy the law but to fulfil, but such a commandment would have been a complete reversal of the law.

III.—In like manner also the eating of blood is forbidden (Lev. xvii., 10). God said, “ I will even set my face against that soul that eateth blood, and will cut him off from among his people.” The particular reason for this (verse 11) is, “ For it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.” This could apply in truth ONLY TO THE BLOOD OF JESUS, which made a real and sufficient atonement for all sin ; but it was impossible for the blood of bulls and goats to atone for sin (Heb. x., 4). How, then,

could Jesus have directed His Disciples to drink His blood? This would have been casting contempt on the law of God.

IV.—If it had been taught that there was *in any sense* blood in the cup which Christians drank, it would have filled the whole Jewish nation with the bitterest indignation, nothing could have been more repugnant to their feelings, it would have greatly intensified their hatred of Christians, as they would have regarded it as casting contempt on their laws and customs, and they would most certainly have laid this to their charge. But the fact that they never once mentioned it is a clear proof that there was no such doctrine.

V.—Lastly, after the time of the Apostles, the teaching and practices of Christians were held up to scorn and ridicule by their heathen enemies. All kinds of false charges were brought against them. They ridiculed Christians for believing in a God who was born, who was crucified, and buried. They laughed at the idea of the resurrection, and a hell or Heaven. Those who wrote a defence of the Christian religion, as Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Origen, etc., have given a long list of the blasphemies of both Jews and Gentiles against the Christian religion, but there was never any allusion to any supposed change in the bread and wine. Yet, of all Christian doctrines and practices, there was nothing that could have been so easily ridiculed as the supposed change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. If such a thing had ever been suggested, it could not have been passed over by the clever opponents of the Gospel; but it was never

mentioned. This, again, is a decisive proof that such a doctrine had never been heard of. In fact, it was altogether unknown for the first eight hundred years after Christ, though there had been for a considerable time a gradually increasing and undefined superstition with regard to the sacrament, which prepared the way to what was to follow. Yet, when Paschasius Radbert first brought forward the monstrous doctrine, it was met with opposition, and bitter controversy arose about it. But in the dark ages of ignorance and superstition (as superstition always prefers that which appears wonderful and mysterious), the doctrine gradually spread till it became general, and was accepted by the Church, and made binding on the conscience of all men, and definitely settled at the Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, and now is received on the authority of the Church claiming infallibility, supported by the mere sound of words torn from the context in a few passages, as we have seen, but contrary to the plainest declarations of Scripture, common sense, and history.

Now, we may ask what is the chief work or duty of the "priests" of the Church of Rome? To celebrate the Mass in which it is pretended that they offer the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead. Now, in whatever way we look upon this, it is simply blasphemous. We have seen that it is a grievous sin for a man to take upon himself a part of Christ's untransferable priesthood. We have seen that there can be no change in the bread and wine; and, further, if their wafer did become the body of Christ, it would be a violation of God's law to eat it. But what I would

now point out is, that their teaching is subversive of the Christian religion. That which is the very foundation of the Christian religion is, that Jesus has by His ONE offering of Himself made a sufficient and perfect satisfaction for all sin. The Romish doctrine flatly denies this, for it says that Christ's body and blood, soul and divinity, are present in the sacrament, and are offered as a sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, which is a daring and blasphemous contradiction of Scripture.

If we could for a moment assume that Christ was bodily present in the sacrament, their sacrifice would be of no value, for "without shedding of blood (that is, *without the death of the victim*) there is no remission of sin" (Heb. ix., 22). I think that no Romanist would venture to say that Christ suffers and dies every time a priest says Mass, yet without that the Mass is worse than an empty performance. Nothing is more clearly and constantly asserted in Scripture than that Jesus only once died for sin, and that "being raised from the dead, dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over Him: for in that He died He died unto sin once for all (ἐφάραξ); but in that He liveth He liveth unto God" (Rom. vi., 9 and 10).

CHAPTER XIII.

PURGATORY.

THE assertion that the Mass is a sin-offering for the living and the dead, brings before us the doctrine of Purgatory. Purgatory may be found in the heathen writers Plato and Virgil, but certainly not in the Bible. Yet Romanists pretend to find authority for their doctrine in 1 Cor. iii., 13, where it is said that, "the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is," etc. This fire they say is the fire of purgatory. Now, the circumstances were these (1 Cor. iii.). The Apostle compares the Church of Corinth to a building, of which he had laid the foundation, and other teachers were building upon it. But "let every man take heed how he buildeth thereon. . . . Now, if any man build upon that foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble; every man's work shall be made manifest, for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Now, in the first place, it may be observed, that the fire here mentioned only acts

upon the work, not on the man; but the supposed fire of purgatory acts on *the person only*. Therefore the fire of purgatory is not mentioned here. Next, the whole passage is figurative, the building is figurative, the gold, silver, and precious stones are figurative, the wood, hay, and stubble are figurative, therefore the fire must be figurative, for it would be absurd to require a literal fire to consume figurative chaff. The passage therefore has no reference to purgatory, but it is simply a warning to teachers to take heed that their teaching be profitable, otherwise they will lose their labour and their reward, though they may narrowly escape, because they are on the true foundation, Jesus Christ (verse 11).

Romanists also quote 1 Peter iii., 19 and 20, where we are told that Christ went in spirit and "preached to the spirits in prison, which were sometimes disobedient when once the long-suffering of God waited in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing." When did He preach to them? They say that Christ went and preached to them in purgatory between the crucifixion and resurrection. But this cannot be true, for Jesus went not to purgatory, but to Paradise (Luke xxiii., 43), that is to Heaven (2 Cor. xii., 2-4). Further, those sinners, according to the teaching of the Church of Rome, did not go to purgatory; for if sinners ever died in mortal sin they did, and such do not go to purgatory, but to hell. What was their character? The Book of Genesis vi., 5, says, "that the earth was full of violence, for every thought of the imagination of man's heart was only evil and that continually." But God granted them a respite; they were not in

prison, but in keeping, ἐν φυλακῇ, for 120 years as a time for repentance. During that time Christ's spirit was striving with them (Gen. vi., 3 and 5), with what result? During the whole of that time, as St. Peter says, ἀπειθήσασιν, "*they refused to be persuaded.*" It was during that time that Christ by *His Spirit* preached to them through Noah, just as He preached by His Spirit through the Prophets (see 1 Peter i., 11). The passage is meant to show the completeness of the salvation through Christ, that as Noah and his family were separated by the waters of the flood from the world of the ungodly, so the water of baptism is a figure, ἀντίτυπον, points out that, which completely saves the sinner, namely, the purifying of the heart, "the interrogation of a good conscience towards God." And it may be observed that the passage begins (verse 18) by saying that "Christ suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that He might bring us to God," but ends by saying that we are saved "through the resurrection of Christ." It was His suffering and death that made the atonement. True, but the resurrection was the proof that THE WHOLE DEBT had been paid. 1 Peter i., 3: God "hath begotten us again, unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." Rom iv., 25: Jesus, our Lord, "was delivered up for our trespasses and was raised for our justification, therefore being justified by faith, we have peace with God." But a sinner cannot be justified, nor can we have peace with God TILL EVERY SIN is blotted out; the resurrection gives the assurance that this has been fully accomplished for all believers. Hence (Rom. viii., 33), "Who

shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is Christ Jesus that died, yea, rather, that *was raised from the dead.*" A sufficient answer. Such passages as the above show that the teaching of a need of a purgatory to purify from sin, in any sense, is a flat contradiction of the most important of all Christian doctrines, and casts dishonour on the work of Christ.

Matt. xii., 32, 1 Cor. v., 5, and 1 Cor. xv., 29, are also referred to by Romanists to prove that there is a purgatory. The first tells us that the sin of speaking against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven, "neither in this world, neither in the world to come." The word *αἰων*, here translated world, properly signified "an age," and is properly translated in the Vulgate, the authority of the Church of Rome, by "seculum," which could never be translated by world. And *ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι*, "in that which is to come," distinctly signifies that which is *immediately* to take place. So that our Lord's words would be properly translated by "neither in this (Jewish) age or dispensation, nor in that which is about to succeed it." The Jews were accustomed to speak of their expected Messiah as "He who is to come," *ὁ ἐρχόμενος*, "the coming one" (Luke vii., 19). So the time of the Messiah would be "the coming," *αἰων*, age, or dispensation, the coming Kingdom. But it ought to be particularly observed that Jesus did not call it simply the coming age, or dispensation; *ὁ ἐρχομενος αἰων*, but *αἰων ὁ μέλλων*, the dispensation which is to begin immediately. And as under that present dispensation there was no pardon for presumptuous sin (Num. xv., 30 and

31), so under the new dispensation there would be no pardon for those who, with the wonderful display of divine power before their eyes, resisted the striving of the Spirit, and wilfully and presumptuously attributed the work of God to the devil (Mark iii., 30). They rejected what should have been their accepted time, their day of salvation (2 Cor. vi., 2). Their case was hopeless. But there was no allusion to any purgatory. Besides, purgatory is supposed to be a place to which souls go after leaving this world. But, as before stated, *αἰών* and *seculum* refer to time, neither of them ever refers to place.

The second passage (1 Cor. v., 5) simply states the case of a man who, on account of gross sin, was excluded from Church membership by the congregation, but afterwards (2 Cor. ii., 7 and 8), in consequence of his repentance and putting away the sin, was received into the Church again. What has this to do with purgatory? (Page 88.)

The third passage is (1 Cor. xv., 29), "Else what shall they do who are baptised for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they, then, baptised for the dead?" There is no mention of purgatory here. The passage has always been regarded as a difficulty since there never was in the primitive Church any custom of persons baptised for those who were dead. But as the context is generally, if not always, the best key for explaining what seems difficult, so I am confident that it is so in this case. The whole chapter is on the resurrection; that "as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive." Thus all, who are baptised into Christ's religion, are baptised in the faith of the resurrection,

that is, in the faith that they will themselves rise again. But as this can only take place after death, St. Paul here calls it baptism for the dead, and asks, "What shall they do who are baptised for the dead if the dead rise not?" If there be no resurrection, why should we continually subject ourselves to persecution through being baptised, making a profession of being Christians? This appears the simple meaning of "being baptised for the dead." Baptised in the assurance of their own resurrection. But the Apostle makes not the slightest allusion to anything which may or may not take place between death and the resurrection. Therefore there is not the slightest allusion to any purgatory.

By referring to the passages which we have examined, Romanists clearly show that it is a hopeless task to search the Scriptures for proof of the existence of a purgatory. But the doctrine *is assumed* to be true, and then such passages are supposed to confirm it, if you don't examine them too closely. It is true that they can quote the Fathers in favour of their doctrine, but we must remember that errors very soon crept into the Church. St. Paul tells us that the mystery of iniquity had already begun, and Rev. xvii., 11, tells us that it is *ἐκ τῶν ἐπτά* (see page 10). And converts from heathenism would doubtless, in many cases, hold fast their opinions about the dead. There is nothing more fascinating to human nature than speculations about the state of the departed, so it is easy to imagine that the idea of a purgatory, once admitted, would spread rapidly. But if there were really a purgatory, since it would have been a subject which most seriously

concerned every individual, and might be expected to influence the life and conduct of each, as well as his hopes in the future, it is absurd that neither our Lord nor any one of those whom He commissioned to preach the Gospel should never once plainly mention it. Surely *it would have formed no inconsiderable part of their teaching, warnings, and exhortations*, as it does now in the Church of Rome.

It is remarkable in how many ways the Romish teaching about purgatory is opposed to the teaching of God's word. It is said to be a place where the souls of the departed atone for sins by the suffering of fire, and are purified to fit them for Heaven. How long they may have to endure the pains of purgatory has, I believe, never been determined; but considering that the Popes have sometimes granted indulgences for very long periods, even for thousands of years, the time of suffering must be exceedingly long. The Church of Rome divides sins into mortal and venial, which we have seen to be contrary to Scripture; that for mortal sins there are two kinds of punishment, temporal and eternal; that Jesus died to atone for the eternal part (but the benefit of this can only be obtained through priestly absolution), but, for the other part, and also for all venial sins, the sinner must himself atone, either in this life or in the fire of purgatory. Therefore, logically, no thanks are due from the sinner to Jesus for deliverance from purgatory, for He has done nothing towards it. The sinner must pay the whole debt himself!

This dishonours the Saviour, for the constant teaching of the Scriptures is that "the blood of

Jesus cleanseth from ALL sin," that "He is able to save to the uttermost all that come unto God by Him." But the doctrine of purgatory says, that there is a definite point, beyond which He is not able to save. And when they talk of the fires of purgatory purifying souls to fit them for Heaven, they dishonour the Holy Spirit, for it is *the Holy Spirit alone* that can fit us for Heaven, and that must be done in this life, as St. Paul said, God "*hath made* us meet to be partakers of the inheritance of the saints in light," *not will make fit* (Col. i., 12).

But where the ability of Christ to deliver from suffering is supposed to end, the Church of Rome has discovered some other helps. It is said that the souls in purgatory are helped, and the period of their sufferings shortened, by the prayers of the faithful, by the application of merits of the saints, by Masses, and by indulgences. Let us, then, consider each of these cases.

I.—Prayers for the dead. What authority is there in God's word for this? None whatever. In the second book of Maccabees there is an example, but that book forms no part of Scripture. The Apocrypha was added to the Bible by the Council of Trent, and Bellarmine tries to excuse the early Fathers for not recognising those books by saying that the question had not been settled by any previous general council, as if the Council of Trent had a right to add whatever they would to God's word. The passage in Maccabees simply states the opinion of some Jews. But we are not bound by the opinion of Jews. Jesus tells us that they had rendered the

word of God of none effect by their traditions, and so far as they held such an opinion, it may well be considered as one of their departures from God's word, when we know, that among the many directions for prayer, there is not a single one about praying for the dead. And this is the more remarkable, when we consider, First, that there never was a man, from the time of our first parents, who had not friends or relatives among the dead. Next, that the prayers are supposed to lighten or deliver the souls from such terrible sufferings. If prayers could have been of any service to souls in purgatory, it is impossible to conceive how it could have happened that no single command or direction is given with regard to them. But there is one passage which is confidently quoted as an example of praying for the dead. In 2 Tim. i., 18, we read: "The Lord grant unto him (Onesiphorus) that he may find mercy in that day." But there is no proof that Onesiphorus was dead. "In that day" may refer to the day of his death, just as in the same Epistle iv., 8, St. Paul says of himself, that "in that day," the day of his departure, the Lord would give him a crown of righteousness. If Romanists reject this interpretation, then there remains no other meaning for "in that day" but the day of judgment, or the day of Christ's second coming. In that case, St. Paul's prayer would mean, that there was no hope of Onesiphorus obtaining mercy before Christ's second coming, so that he must be in purgatory still, if he went there at all!

II.—The merits of the saints. It is the theory of the Church of Rome that God accepts the super-

abundant works of one in atonement for the defective service of another. This is contrary to the truth, that "everyone shall give an account of himself to God." This could only be partially true if some of a man's sins were cancelled by the good deeds of another. Next, we have already seen that works of supererogation are impossible, and can only be imagined by reducing God's law to some human standard (see page 79 on Supererogation).

III., Masses, and IV., Indulgences, have already been dealt with. Now, the thought occurs, if it is necessary that souls should go to purgatory as the Church of Rome teaches, and as the word purgatory implies, in order to be purified and so fitted for Heaven, where must they go if by any or all the foregoing means they are released from purgatory before the purgation is complete? Of course, they are not fit for Heaven. How are they to be made fit? If there are other means of purifying them, then it would seem that such means might have been adopted without the necessity of their suffering in purgatory at all.

Purgatory has been an inexhaustible source of wealth to the Church of Rome. By payment Masses can be obtained any day, and as often as desired, and even "in perpetuity." Frequently money is left, sometimes large amounts, for this purpose. It is a very common thing in Spanish papers to see notices that all the Masses which will be said on a certain day in a certain Church, sometimes in several Churches, will be said for the benefit of someone's soul who died some years before. Why all for one soul? Simply because they are paid

for. Then, woe to those souls for which none are said! To increase the sale, pathetic appeals are made to the living to remember and help the souls of their friends in purgatory. Indulgences also have brought in great wealth. That great and splendid Church, St. Peter's, in Rome, was built by that means. For this purpose Pope Leo X. published plenary indulgences, the principal condition of which was a contribution to the work; so Romanists represent the case; but in plain language the indulgences were sold, and as much money as possible was extracted for them; but no money, no indulgence. There had been a brisk sale of indulgences before, but the shameless way in which this was carried on fanned into a flame the smouldering embers of discontent which brought about the Reformation. Since that time the Church has been more discreet in this matter, and little is heard in Protestant countries of the sale of indulgences, but it is still carried on in Spain, and no doubt in other Catholic countries. However, taking Masses and Indulgences together, we may say that the Church of Rome does not offer salvation "without money and without price." Moreover, the teaching of the Church of Rome casts discredit on the wisdom and goodness of God. We may ask, is it consistent with infinite wisdom and goodness to let the suffering of poor souls in purgatory be prolonged, because their friends on earth had forgotten them, or were too poor or too selfish to pay for Masses for them, whilst the period of suffering in other cases was lessened by the purchase of Masses before death, or by the purchase by friends after their

death; and still more, that others, whose sins were even greater, should escape purgatory altogether by the purchase of plenary indulgences?

But some indulgences may be purchased at a ridiculously cheap rate.

Thus, I read in "What every Christian must know and do," page 13, Rule of life, "In the morning, before you get up, make the sign of the cross, and say, 'Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, I give you my heart and my soul.' Each time you say this prayer you get an indulgence of one hundred days, which you can give to the souls in purgatory." In the first place, that is no prayer at all. Next, by thus uniting Mary and Joseph with Jesus in an act of worship, it is a violation of the First Commandment, and that is a work of supererogation. But some other important questions occur to me. It takes scarcely five seconds to pronounce those twelve words. If pronouncing those words gains an indulgence of one hundred days, how many days indulgence is gained by a single Mass, in which the priest offers up the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Christ as a sacrifice? And as many Masses are often said for a single soul, without any evidence that they have sufficed to deliver that soul, it suggests that the period of suffering in purgatory must be immense. Again, if a person should utter these words once a day for a whole year, he would get indulgence of 100 years. But if he should begin at ten years of age, and continue till he was aged seventy, he would get 6,000 years' indulgence. But if he should give only one minute a day to the repetition (and the use of the rosary suggests that

there could be no reason against it), he would gain an indulgence of 72,000 years. Only think, 72,000 years for only one minute a day! Truly, the duration of suffering in purgatory must be immense to admit of such indulgences! Did Cardinal Cullen, when he attached his "Imprimatur † Paulus Cullen, Archiepiscopus Dublinensis," make any calculation? Perhaps not, but that is of no consequence. His authority as a teacher of Romish doctrine was as good as that of any other Cardinal, and was accepted by many thousands of priests and people.

Next, I would observe that the effect of the teaching of purgatory is directly opposite to that of the Gospel. There is in man a natural fear of death, apart from any consideration of what may follow. But as long as it can be looked upon as at a distance, men put the thought of it away; they may even harden themselves against it. But when it comes very near, how anxious most persons are to put it off, even for a short time. Now, the Church of Rome has added to this natural fear, or shrinking from death, for those who accept her teaching—the certainty of a long and indefinite period of suffering in the fires of purgatory. So, throughout life, whenever the thought arises, it must be accompanied with a feeling of dread, though it may be, to a very great extent, shut out by present circumstances. As an example, a lady, whom I once met, who in health appeared to be of a cheerful disposition, was overtaken with sickness, which forced upon her the probability of death. She then told a friend that she was horribly afraid of death because of the sufferings of purgatory. She, however, re-

covered, but the fear of death and purgatory would still have to be faced.

Now, consider the contrast. Whilst the thought of purgatory naturally increases the fear of death, the effect of the Gospel, if fully accepted, altogether takes away that fear; for (Heb. ii., 15) Christ died "that He might deliver them, who, through fear of death, were all their lifetime subject to bondage," that is, that He might deliver them from the bondage of that fear. Hence St. Paul (Phil. i., 23) expressed his desire "to depart and to be with Christ." And in 2 Cor. v., 1-8, he says, "We know that if our house of this tabernacle (not a permanent dwelling) were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands eternal in the Heavens Therefore we are always confident, knowing that whilst we are at home in the body we are absent from the Lord. We are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body and to be present with the Lord." Death is hardly thought of, except as a removal to a better place, not to any purgatory. Hence he exclaims in 1 Cor. xv., 55, "O death where is thy sting?" If there were a purgatory, death would have sting enough. "The sting of death is sin," but thanks be to God, "The blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth from all sin" (1 John i., 7), not only from what Romanists call mortal sins, but from what they falsely call venial sins.

Hence we may observe that purgatory robs Christ of the gratitude due to Him, for how can a man be thankful for deliverance from the punishment of the multitude of his venial sins, and the

temporal punishment of his mortal sins, when he believes that there is no such deliverance, but he must bear the punishment himself? Moreover, man is much more affected by that which is near than by that which is at a distance, so that trifling things often exclude from the mind all thoughts of serious and important things supposed to be at a distance; just so the long period of purgatorial sufferings, being near at hand, would extinguish altogether all feeling of gratitude for a supposed deliverance after an unknown length of time. And when gratitude is absent, the love which should accompany gratitude will be absent also. But how different is the case of one who fully believes God's word, that Jesus (Heb. x., 14), "by one offering, hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified." Sanctified and purified in heart by faith in Jesus, and "made meet for the inheritance of the saints in light" (Acts xxvi., 18, Col. i., 12). Such a one has infinite cause for "rejoicing in the Lord always," and for gratitude and love. Thus 1 Peter i., 8 and 9: "Whom (Jesus) not having seen ye love; in whom, though now ye see Him not, yet believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory; receiving the end of your faith, the salvation of your souls." Love is, above all things, that which God requires, and is the strongest incentive to a holy life. The fear of purgatory may have a powerful influence on many, and lead them to do many things. But as water can never rise above its own level, so the true quality of our actions can never rise above the motives and feelings which prompted those actions, however good they may appear to man. So

those actions which spring from fear can never be compared with, or be a substitute for, those which are prompted by love and gratitude. Thus again we find that the teaching of the Church of Rome is directly opposed to the teaching of the Gospel.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BIBLE AND ROMISH ACCOUNT OF MARY.

THE Church of Rome teaches, that Mary was the daughter of Joachim and Anna (St. Ann); that she was conceived and born absolutely free from sin (the immaculate conception); that she remained a Virgin, and perfectly free from sin during the whole of her life; that a few days after her death her body and soul were taken up to Heaven (the assumption) by Jesus and the angels; that she was crowned and reigns as the Queen of Heaven; that prayers offered to her meet with a more certain and speedy answer than those addressed to God. She is constantly spoken of as "the mother of God."

How much of all this is to be found in the Bible? There are two passages on which the Church of Rome relies. The first is (Gen. iii., 15), "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed, it shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." The Romish version reads, "She shall bruise," etc., which is an imperfect rendering of a bad translation. The Vulgate version, which is the authorised standard of the Church of Rome, was completed at the beginning of

the fifth century when the Church had greatly departed from the simplicity of the Gospel. Now, the Vulgate for "it shall bruise" puts "*ipsa*," which properly signifies "she herself," not simply "she," as the Church of Rome translates it. Now, supposing the Vulgate translation was correct, what would it mean? The woman is mentioned three times. I cannot understand how anyone who reads the passage with common sense without prejudice could for one moment hesitate in saying, that in each case the same woman is meant, namely Eve, and therefore the Vulgate would mean, that it was Eve, and no one else, that was to bruise the serpent's head. But if "*ipsa*" refers to the Virgin Mary, as the Church of Rome teaches, it would mean that Mary herself was to bruise the serpent's head, and therefore that Jesus had nothing to do with it. But when we go to the original Hebrew, we find that it is "He shall bruise." And the Septuagint, which was constantly quoted by our Lord and His Apostles, distinctly says, "He shall bruise," *αὐτός*. He, the seed of the woman, Jesus Christ.

The other passage (Luke i., 28), the angel's salutation to Mary. The Vulgate gives "*gratiâ plena*," rightly translated, "full of grace." Hence Romanists constantly use the words, "Hail, Mary, full of grace," as if she were the author or bestower of grace. But the Vulgate translation is wrong. The word in the original Greek signifies in the active voice, "to bestow a favour," but in the passive, "to receive a favour." In the present case it is most certainly in the passive voice, and therefore the salutation was, "Hail, thou favoured one," and

this is confirmed by verse 30, "Thou hast found or obtained favour." Now, if she had deserved this honour, it could not be called a favour, "grace" (Rom. xi., 6).

With regard to the expressions, "Blessed art thou among women," and "all nations shall call me blessed," we need not dwell on them. We read in the Book of Judges, "Blessed above women is Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite." No doctrine can be built on such expressions. But no Christian will deny the fact that Mary was indeed blessed in being the mother of Jesus, for this was an honour which could never be shared by any other woman. But we utterly reject as blasphemous, and absurd, the expression "Mother of God." A mother must, of necessity, be older than that of which she is the mother. Mary was the mother of Christ's human nature, but certainly not of His divine nature. St. Paul, in Rom. i., 3, marks this distinction.

We will now turn to the family of Mary. We have two genealogies, one given by St. Matthew, the other by St. Luke. That given by St. Matthew is not the genealogy of Mary, nor of our Lord, but of Joseph, the husband of Mary. We are distinctly told (Matt. i., 18), that Joseph was not the father of Jesus. It may then be asked, why was that genealogy given, if it was not the genealogy of Jesus? Simply because it was necessary for those for whom the Gospel was written. That Gospel was written the earliest of the Gospels, whilst Jewish Christians outnumbered Gentile Christians. It was written for Jews, hence the frequent references to the Old Testament.* Now, according to the law

* See Addenda, page 287.

of Moses, an heiress could only marry in her own tribe, because an inheritance was not to pass from one tribe to another. The law is found in Num. xxxvi., 8 and 9. We may also notice that, in the enumeration of families, females are never mentioned, except for some special reason, consequently, for the same reason, they are not mentioned in the genealogies. Now, Zelophehad left an inheritance and daughters, but no son. Supposing, then, that X married one of his daughters and a child was born to them, in the genealogy X would take the place of his wife and the child would be said to be the son of X, the son of Zelophehad. The name of Zelophehad's daughter would not be mentioned. As St. Matthew's Gospel was written for Jews, no explanation is given for what may seem to us so strange. We have another example in Ezra ii., 61. The children of Habaiah, the children of Koz . . . took a wife of the daughters of Barzillai, and was called by their name, that is, was called the son of Barzillai. Now, the promise had been given that the Messiah should be born in the family of David. This therefore was the inheritance of the family of David. And as the fulfilment of the promise was to be accomplished through Mary, she might rightly be called the heiress of the promise. And by her betrothal to Joseph, who was also of the family of David, the requirements of the law were fulfilled.

Let us now turn to the genealogy given in the Gospel of St. Luke, which was written to a Gentile and for Gentiles. This is universally acknowledged to be the genealogy of Mary, and therefore of our Lord. In chapter iii., 23, we read, "Jesus . . .

· M

being the son (as was supposed) of Joseph, the son of Heli," etc. Here it is needful to observe that "as was supposed" in this case does not give the correct signification of the word νομιζω, it is only a secondary signification. The primary and correct translation is, "as he was accounted by law and custom." The word is derived from νομος, a law (see Liddle and Scott's Greek Lexicon, νομιζω, to own as a custom or usage, to use customarily. So of all customs and usages, especially when they have got force of law by prescription). The law or custom here referred to is that before mentioned. Joseph was not the son of Heli, but of Jacob (Matt i., 16). Mary was the daughter of Heli, but in the genealogy, according to custom, the name of Joseph, her husband, is given instead of hers. In writing to Gentiles this explanation by St. Luke was necessary.

Now, let us see how the Church of Rome deals with the two genealogies. The note in the R.C. Bible on Matt. i., 16, "The husband of Mary. The Evangelist gives us rather the pedigree of St. Joseph than of the blessed Virgin to conform to the custom of the Hebrews, who, in their genealogies, took no notice of women; but as they were near akin, the pedigree of the one sheweth the pedigree of the other." In looking at the two genealogies, I think it would puzzle anyone to imagine how the pedigree of the one sheweth the pedigree of the other, for they are as different as they possibly can be. From the time of David, that is, for a thousand years, the two genealogies run on perfectly separate lines.

The following is her explanation of Luke iii., 23,

R.C. Bible: "Who was of Heli. St. Joseph, who by nature was the son of Jacob (St. Matt. i., 16), in the account of the law was the son of Heli. For Heli and Jacob were brothers by the same mother; and Heli, who was the elder, dying without issue, Jacob, as the law directed, married his widow; in consequence of such marriage, his son Joseph was reputed to be the son of Heli." Now, there is not the shadow of evidence that Jacob and Heli were brothers in any sense, or that Heli died childless. But passing by this difficulty, the explanation renders the genealogy in St. Matthew's Gospel useless, since no reason could be given why it should have been recorded. The insertion of Joseph's name in the genealogy by St. Luke rests, according to the Church of Rome, on a totally different ground, and the genealogy has nothing to do with it. In the next place, the law referred to is wrongly interpreted. The obligation lay not on the brother of the deceased, but on the widow (Deut. xxv., 5): "The wife of the dead shall not marry without unto a stranger," and when it is said that the brother shall marry her, it simply means the nearest kinsman. If there was a brother, he would be the nearest kinsman. But he, for good reason, might refuse (see Ruth iii., 12 and 13, iv., 6-8). Boaz could not marry Ruth till a nearer kinsman refused to do so. Now, if Jacob was married when Heli died, he had a good reason for refusing to marry his widow. For God's purpose in marriage, as explained by our Lord (Matt. xix., 5), was, from the beginning, one man, one woman, and "they two shall be one flesh." But if, notwithstanding this, Jacob did

marry his brother's widow, and Joseph were the son of the former marriage, Mary being the daughter of Heli's widow and Jacob, it would follow that Joseph married his father's daughter, which was unlawful; and this illegality was increased by the fact (R.C. note) that "Joseph, in the account of the law, was the son of Heli. Therefore Joseph and Mary were legally brother and sister, as if both were born of the same father and mother. But if Jacob were not married when he took Heli's widow, it would follow that Joseph and Mary were actually children of the same mother and father! I know not how Romanists could tolerate the idea of Mary being married to her own brother. But the Church of Rome teaches that the Bible is not to be read without her own explanations, and here is the result of one of her explanations! Perhaps Romanists would say that as Mary continued a virgin to the end of her life this relationship was of no consequence. Whether she did so continue is a question to be answered. But we are judged not only by what we do, but by *our thoughts and intentions*; and as Joseph and Mary could not have had the remotest idea about the miraculous birth of a child when they were betrothed (Matt. i., 18 and 19, Luke i., 34), it must have been their intention when married to live together like every other married couple, notwithstanding the fact that they were brother and sister! *Without such intention, there could have been no betrothal. They could have lived together without any betrothal, as Lazarus and his sisters did.*

The fact is, Joseph and Mary were in no way related to each other except that both were descended

from David. That was the starting point of their relationship, as the two genealogies clearly prove.

But the difficulties of the Church of Rome do not end here. She has adopted the legend that Mary was the daughter of Joakim and Anna. How does this agree with the genealogy? By asserting that Eli is the shortened form of Eliakim; that Eliakim is another form for Joakim, and therefore Joakim and Eli were the same person. Here we have a number of impossibilities and absurdities. There is no proof that "Eli" was ever used as a shortened form of any name. There are about thirty different names in the Bible beginning with Eli; to which of them would it properly belong? There are several Eliakims mentioned in the Bible, but the name is never cut short. And there is an Eliakim mentioned by St. Luke iii., 30. Why did he not write "Eli" in that case? Why should he give a mutilated form in the very place which required the greatest accuracy, and that without any explanation? That he could do so is incredible. Next, how can Joakim be the same as Eliakim? It was so, because Pharaoh, King of Egypt, changed the name of Eliakim, the son of Josiah, King of Judah, to Jehoiakim, or Joakim! The name almost suggests the thought that the explanation was given as a joke! On the same principle, every Joseph may be called Zaphnath-paaneah, because Pharaoh gave that name to Joseph in Egypt! Finally, we must consider what St. Luke really wrote. He wrote not *ἑλί*, Eli, pronounced short as in elephant, but *ἡλεί*, Heelei (or, perhaps, better represented by Halei, both syl-

lables long). And in Greek it is not so easy to get rid of the aspirate "h" as it is often dropped in English, and "η" and "ε" are by no means interchangeable. Therefore to assume that Heli is a shortened form of Eliakim is to assume an impossibility.

No doubt most Romanists accept the tale about Joakim and St. Ann without examination. But he who can accept it after looking into the evidence is quite ready to act upon Cardinal Wiseman's rule, "If what your senses tell you is white, the Church declares black; or what your senses say is black, the Church defines as white, you must reject reason and the evidence of your senses and believe the Church." But to such as are willing to accept the evidence of St. Luke, it will be manifest that Heli was the father of Mary, and Joakim and St. Ann are only mythical personages, and therefore "the immaculate conception of Mary" is also a pure myth, in spite of the beautiful legends about St. Ann, and the wonderful doings of Mary in her childhood.

Of the early life of Mary, absolutely nothing is known before she was espoused to Joseph, when we are told that "he knew her not till she brought forth her firstborn son" (Matt. i., 25). From this, two facts are manifest, the statement of which is rank heresy to the Church of Rome.

First, that Mary, after the birth of Jesus, lived with her husband as every godly married woman does. Second, that Mary had other children after the birth of Jesus.

The Church of Rome tries to exalt Mary by teaching that, though she had a husband, she lived as

though she had not, because the Church regards the married state as less holy than the unmarried. But that is not God's view. God could never have chosen the less holy state as an emblem of His own union with His people. But He has frequently spoken of Himself as married to His people, both in the Old and New Covenant (see Eph. v., 25-33). We are told (Gen. v., 22) that "Enoch walked with God and begat sons and daughters," and in this state "he had the testimony that he pleased God." Marriage was instituted in the time of man's innocence, and it did not make him less innocent, or less holy. But in this matter the Church of Rome seeks to set up a standard of holiness higher than God's.

Next, by calling Jesus Mary's firstborn, it is implied that she had other children. To answer this, Romanists reply, that the word "firstborn" is often used when there are no other children. Very true, but under what circumstances? When a child is born, it may be called the firstborn, and if another is born after it, it would rightly continue to be called the firstborn. But if no other followed, the term "firstborn" would soon be changed into "only son," or "only child." Who ever heard of an only son being called the firstborn after he had come to manhood? I never heard or read of such a case, and I would ask those who cling to the idea, that Jesus was the only son of Mary, to try if they can find such a case in any history or biography. We may therefore conclude that the expression, "her firstborn son," is a plain and definite statement that she had other children. But we need not rest on a single expression, though that is plain enough, for

each of the Gospels on several occasions mentions the brothers of our Lord, so also does St. Paul. The Church of Rome tries to set aside all this plain language, sometimes by saying that these brothers of Jesus were the children of Joseph by a former marriage. But there is not the shadow of evidence of any such marriage. On the contrary, when he went from Galilee with Mary to Bethlehem, if he had had a family he would have taken them with him. How long he was there before Jesus was born we are not told, but he was there for more than a month after His birth. (Compare Luke ii., 22, with Lev. xii., 4-6.) When he went down to Egypt he took Mary and the child Jesus, but there is no mention of any other children. How long he continued in Egypt we are not told; it was till the death of Herod. On his return he intended to settle in Judea, but, hearing that Archelaus was reigning in the place of his father Herod, he was afraid to go there, but went and settled at Nazareth. All this excludes the idea of Joseph having a family. But more frequently we are told that they were only cousins. This, again, is mere assumption, without a shadow of evidence to rest upon. How is it that they are always called brothers, and never once called cousins, or by the general term relations? The truth is the Church of Rome would have us believe anything we like about the brethren, or brothers, of Jesus, if it be not what the Gospels clearly state. So we are told that the Jews used the word "brother" in such different ways that no argument can be built upon it. The Jews did not use the word in as many ways as it is used among our-

selves. It is often used of those who follow the same trade or profession, of those who belong to the same association, of those who hold the same opinions, whether in politics, religion, or other matters. It is often used in addressing a mixed multitude, and often in speaking to a single person even though he be a stranger, yet there is never any difficulty in understanding the word. When a man's brothers are spoken of, did it ever really occur to anyone, that the word is so indefinite that it could not be known what was meant? The Jews would have no more difficulty than we have (see Matt. xiii., 55 and 56). There we have the language of those who were intimately acquainted with the family of Jesus, "Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary? And his brothers James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And His sisters, are they not all with us?" We might as well question whether the Mary here mentioned was His mother as to question whether the other persons mentioned were His brothers and sisters, and conclude that St. Paul, the Evangelists, and the multitude were in a conspiracy to deceive us.

Next, was Mary always free from sin? There is not a single passage in Scripture that signifies that she was, nor one to lead us to believe that she was different from other women. On one occasion Jesus said, "There is none good but one, that is God." Therefore Mary must be included among the "All have sinned and come short of the glory of God." On another occasion He said of the Centurion's faith, "I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel." But Mary was an Israelite; she therefore

fell far behind the Roman Centurion in faith. He recognised the divine nature of Jesus, she did not. She knew that His birth was miraculous, but so was the birth of Issac, and of John the Baptist; and she might not recognise the difference. Her belief about the Messiah exactly agreed with that of every other Jew. They believed that the Christ was to be a man, just like other men; that the Kingdom which He was to establish was to be of this world, like that of David or Solomon, only far more glorious and permanent; and for the glory of that Kingdom, and because God had promised it, they spake of it as the Kingdom of God or of Heaven; that the Christ was to drive out the Romans, and reduce all enemies to subjection. But they also believed that His being made King depended on the will of the people (John vi., 15, x., 24). The chief priests and Pharisees hated Him, because He exposed their wickedness and hypocrisy, but they had the same opinion as the multitude, and therefore they feared lest the people should make Him their King. In such a case, since He would not take up arms against the Romans, such a Messiah, they thought, would be the end of their national greatness (John xi., 47-50). The chosen Disciples also thought that Jesus was to be a great King like David, that His Kingdom was to be of this world; hence their disputes as to which of them was to be the greatest, and this rooted opinion entirely prevented them from understanding when He spake to them, in the plainest possible language, about His sufferings, death and resurrection. They and the multitude retained their expectation till they saw Him

MARY DIFFERED NOT FROM OTHER WOMEN

apparently helpless in the hands of His enemies. The expectation of the multitude rested wholly on worldly ambition; they had no personal love for Jesus, therefore their disappointed hope at once turned to bitter hatred. The Disciples were equally, perhaps even more, disappointed than they, but they had learned to love Jesus with a love which no disappointment could quench.

Now, let us look at the case of Mary. We shall see that she stood exactly on the same level as others. On one occasion, when the teaching of Jesus provoked the anger of the Pharisees, and He did nothing to conciliate them, some of His family or household (*οἱ παρ' αὐτοῦ* exactly corresponds with the French "de chez de lui") went out to take Him by force, *κρατῆσαι*, for they said, "He is beside Himself" (Mark iii., 21). They thought that He was destroying His chance of being made King, and therefore was acting madly. Now, who were these members of His family? In verse 31 we are told they were His mother and His brothers. Was there no sin in this? There was a great amount of presumption and a great lack of humility, and that is sin. And they certainly did not believe in Him, and if this is sin, then the mother of Jesus was not without sin. We have another example in John vii., 3-5. The brothers of Jesus, who did not believe in His divine nature, but regarded His miraculous powers as given to Him, that He might thereby gain popularity as a means of obtaining the Kingdom, advised Him to go and display His powers in Judea. In this case Mary is not mentioned, but it confirms the former passage, and shows that Mary

and her household were fully imbued with the anticipation of a wordly Kingdom.

There is another very important point to be considered. We are told that when Jesus was twelve years of age, He was taken by Mary and Joseph to Jerusalem. On their return, Jesus stayed behind, and, when after three days they found Him in the Temple, His mother reproved Him (which shows that she knew not His divine nature). He answered, "Did ye not know that I must be about my Father's business?" But His mother could not understand what He said. Had she believed in His divine nature she must have understood. He then returned with Joseph and Mary to Nazareth, and was subject unto them. This subjection to Mary continued till He was thirty years old (Joseph it appears was dead before that time). From a child He had loved His mother with a perfect love, and doubtless continued to address her as "mother," for, with His loving nature, we could hardly imagine how He could change or drop that affectionate word. As He obeyed, so she ruled with a mother's affection. But at the beginning of His ministry, at the marriage feast at Cana (John ii., 4), she still seemed to be acting towards Him as before, but He at once clearly intimated that there must be a change. He began His reply with the word "woman." This word addressed to a mother in Greek does not sound quite so harshly as in English. Still, it was not "mother," it marked a change. His love never changed, but circumstances were changed. Then He added, "What have I to do with thee?" The very mildest construction that can be put

upon these words signify that her authority and influence upon Him, as a mother, was now at an end. He must now act in everything, when and how He thought best. Hitherto He had, it might be said, belonged to her, but, henceforth, He belonged to the world, that He had come to save, of which she formed a part. Now she must learn that there was something far more important than natural affection. So we read (Mark iii., 33-35), that when the multitude said to Him, "Behold thy mother and thy brothers without seek for thee." He answered them and said, "Who is my mother? or my brothers?" And, looking round on them, which sat round about Him, He said, "Behold my mother and my brothers, for whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother and sister and mother." These words plainly declare that the nearest earthly relationship, even to Himself, as mother or brother, count as nothing in the Kingdom of God, if the spiritual relationship be wanting. Hence He requires of us a love above all earthly ties (Matt. x., 37). On another occasion (Luke xi., 27), a certain woman said unto Him, "Blessed is the womb that bare thee and the breasts which thou hast sucked." But He said, "Yea, rather blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." These words again signify that if Mary had no better ground of hope for salvation than the fact that she was the mother of Jesus, she would certainly be lost. Surely, between this and the teaching of the Church of Rome there is a vast difference! An impassable gulf!

When Mary stood by the cross and saw her son

suffering a most agonising and shameful death between two robbers, the prediction of old Simeon was fulfilled (Luke ii., 35): "A sword shall pierce through thine own soul also." Jesus saw it, and in sympathy commended her to the care of the Disciple whom He loved. In doing this, He still used the word "woman," not "mother" (John xix., 26 and 27). This is the more remarkable when we observe that in the words He used, when He addressed the Disciple whom He loved, He said, "Behold, thy mother," not "my mother." Mary's ambitious expectation of great worldly power and glory for her son, which she had fondly cherished for more than thirty years, was completely shattered—a fit preparation for receiving the truth about her son's birth, life, teaching, death, and resurrection. It is remarkable that there is no mention of Jesus appearing to His mother after His resurrection, as He did to Mary Magdalene and others. No doubt she saw Him when He appeared to the Disciples in the room, where they were gathered together for fear of the Jews. And after His ascension we are told that the mother of Jesus and His brothers assembled with the other Disciples daily in prayer till the day of Pentecost. On that day they were all assembled together, and all received the Holy Spirit, Mary as well as the rest. The Holy Spirit enabled them to comprehend the whole truth, and brought to their remembrance all that Jesus had said unto them (John xiv., 26, xvi., 13), and made them understand what before had seemed so difficult and so mysterious.

Again, it is remarkable that after the day of Pen-

tecost the mother of Jesus is NEVER ONCE MENTIONED OR EVEN ALLUDED TO. This perfect silence is worthy of note, and is most eloquent. If the Apostles' teaching is worth anything, it signifies that no honour is to be paid for her, nor any help to be expected from her. This perfect silence is confirmed by plain declaration on the other side. Thus St. Paul (1 Cor. iv., 1 and 2) speaks of himself as a steward of the mysteries of God; and says that stewards are required to act faithfully, and that he would have to give an account of his stewardship to God. Thus he claims to have acted faithfully in preaching the Gospel. No doubt James, Peter and John were equally faithful.

Yet not one of them, as before stated, makes any allusion to Mary. Again, St. Paul, in his address to the elders of the Church of Ephesus, said (Acts xx., 20), that he had not kept back anything that was profitable, etc., and in verse 27, that he had declared unto them the whole counsel of God. Therefore honour and prayers to Mary, in any sense whatever, are unprofitable, and contrary to the counsel and will of God. If, then, an Apostolic Church means one that adheres to the example and teaching of the Apostles, the Church of Rome is most unapostolic, for it has gone away from the example and teaching of the Apostles as far as it is possible to go. See the extravagant honour and worship paid to Mary by that Church (pages 53, 54, and following pages). For the doctrine of the immaculate conception, see page 129; the assumption, pages 48 and 49.

EXTRAVAGANT WORSHIP OF MARY.

Cardinal Bonaventura, in the fifteenth century, took each of the Psalms and so altered them as to make them addressed, not to Jehovah, but to Mary. And this form of devotion, translated into Italian, was published at Rome in the year 1840. At that time nothing could be printed at Rome without the permission of the master of the Apostolic Palace. It is evident, therefore, that the Church of Rome allowed the worship, which belongs to God only, to be paid to Mary. And why should it not? Such language as before quoted shows that far more reverence, love, and devotion is paid to her than to God. In other words, the creature is more truly worshipped than the Creator. I will now give a few quotations from "The Glories of Mary," printed by Burnes, Oates & Co., a work of St. Liguori, of whose writings the Church of Rome has declared that they are absolutely free from error. I will also give quotations from the Roman Catholic Bible, which will show to what a fearful and blasphemous extent the Church of Rome perverts the word of God even as translated by herself.

GLORIES OF MARY.

"Mary so loved the world as to give her only begotten son" (page 478).

Jesus Himself said, "Were it not for the prayers of my mother, there would be no hope of mercy" (page 479). (When did Jesus say this?)

ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE.

"God so loved the world as to give His only begotten Son" (John iii., 16).

Jesus said, "Come unto me all you that labour and are burdened, and I will refresh you" (Matt. xi., 25).

"Thou (Mary) art my only hope."

"Thou alone canst help me."

"Lady in heaven, we have but one advocate, and that is thyself."

"and thou alone art truly loving and solicitous for our salvation" (page 168). "If my Redeemer rejects me on account of my sins and drives me from His sacred feet, I will cast myself at those of His beloved mother, Mary, and there will I remain prostrate till she has obtained my forgiveness" (page 90).

"The eternal Father gave the office of Judge and Avenger to the Son, and that of mercy and relieving the necessitous to the mother" (page 14).

"Jesus Christ yesterday, and to day and the same for ever" (Heb. xiii., 8).

"Christ Jesus our hope" (1 Tim. i., 1). "Christ in you the hope of glory" (Col. i., 27).

"He is able to save for ever them that come to God by Him" (Heb. vii., 25).

"If any man sin we have an advocate with the Father Jesus Christ the just" (1 John, ii., 1). "There is one God and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus" (1 Tim., ii., 5).

"The Lord not willing that any should perish" (2 Peter, iii., 9). Jesus said, "Him that cometh to me I will not cast out."

"Having therefore a great high priest that hath passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast on our confidence. For we have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities. . . . Let us go therefore with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in season" (Heb. iv., 14-16).

"God sent not His Son into the world to judge the world, but that the world may be saved" (John iii., 17)

"My Queen and my Advocate with Thy Son, whom I dare not approach" (page 115).

"Those who do not serve Mary will not be saved" (page 215).

"If God is angry with a sinner, and Mary takes him under her protection, she withholds the avenging arm of her son, and saves him" (page 98).

"Mary commands in heaven" (page 569).

"If any man love not our Lord Jesus Christ let him be anathema" (1 Cor. xvi., 22).

"Fear is not in charity (love), but perfect charity casteth out fear" (1 John iv., 18).

"The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve" (Matt. iv., 10).

"Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved" (Acts xvi., 31).

"He doth according to His will as well with the powers of heaven as among the inhabitants of the earth, and there is none that can resist His hand, and say to Him, why hast Thou done it?" (Daniel iv., 32).

Jesus said, "All power is given unto me in heaven and earth" (Matt. xxviii., 18).

These are a few passages out of a great number, all of which exalt Mary above God and the Lord Jesus Christ, especially in everything calculated to win the love, affection and adoration of mankind. Yet not a single quotation could be adduced from the R.C. Bible in support of any one of them, but on the contrary many quotations might be given in condemnation of each of them. And what could be more impious or irreverent or blasphemous than the following words in "The Glories of Mary," page

476: "Behold the power of the Virgin mother; she wounded and took captive the heart of God."

In the same work, page 83, there is the following: "Modern heretics cannot endure that we should salute and call Mary our Hope, 'Hail our Hope'! They say that God is alone our Hope, and that He curses those who put their trust in creatures. This is what heretics say; but, in spite of it, the Holy Church obliges all ecclesiastics and religieux each day to invoke and call Mary by the sweet name of our Hope. The Hope of all." This is equivalent to saying, that since they have the authority of the Church, that is sufficient, nothing more is required, and that the word of God is of no consequence. And this is confirmed by the quotations above given. As a heretic in the estimation of the Church of Rome, I believe that such are under the curse. "Thus saith the Lord: Cursed be the man that trusteth in man, and maketh flesh his arm, and whose heart departeth from the Lord" (Jer. xvii., 5, R.C. Bible). In Exod. xx., 5, God calls Himself a jealous God, that is, He is jealous of His own honour. He will not allow the honour, the love, the trust and confidence, the service, the reverence, the worship and adoration which are due to Him to be rendered to any creature.

To me it is a subject of amazement how men, calling themselves Christians, can, as in the passages before quoted, prefer the words of man to those of the living God. They cannot love God's word, which is the truth (John xvii., 17), and, at the same time, accept that which is contrary to it. To me there seems but one way of accounting for it

(2 Thess. ii., 10, R.C. Bible): "Because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying."

On the title page of my Vulgate Bible the mother of Jesus is represented crowned, sitting on the clouds of Heaven with the infant Jesus on her knees, which signifies that she rules Him now as when He was a child. And therefore she reigns as Queen in Heaven, where her will is supreme, as the passages before quoted show to be the teaching of the Church of Rome. What difference is there between the way she is thus worshipped and the idolatry of the Jews (Jer. xlv., 17-19), "burning incense to the Queen of Heaven"? And if this was condemned, how can the other escape?

Our Lord says (Matt. vi., 24), Ye cannot serve, that is, render *dulia* to, two masters. And St. Paul (1 Thess. i., 9) says that the Thessalonians turned from idols to render *dulia* to the living and true God. But the Church of Rome renders to Mary *hyperdulia*, that is, more than *dulia*—how much more the foregoing evidence shows.

PART III.

THE CLAIMS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

LET us now turn to the vast claims of the Church of Rome, that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, is the head of the whole Christian Church, and that without submission to the Pope there can be no salvation. This claim is founded upon Matt. xvi., 18 and 19: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven."

First, there is no proof that the Pope is the successor of Peter. But, passing by this for the present, we may ask, Did our Lord say that His Church would be built by Peter? Certainly not. The word Peter means a stone, but the Church was built on a rock, Petra. The reply of Romanists to this is, that our Lord spoke in the Syro-Chaldaic language, in which there is no difference between a stone and a rock. This may be questioned, but it is not worth dwelling upon, since what we have to rely upon are the words of the Gospel. St.

Matthew, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, used the two words. The Vulgate, which the Church of Rome professes to follow, has the two words. If it had been meant that the Church was to be built on Peter, the natural expression would have been, "Thou art Peter, and upon thee will I build," etc. But why was the word changed if it was not to signify that the Church was not to be built on Peter? Can any other reason be assigned for the change? Jesus had asked His Disciples, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter, who was always the first to answer, sometimes wisely, and sometimes very foolishly (as in verses 22 and 23, and Luke ix., 33, "not knowing what he said"), on this occasion, taught of God, replied, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." Then Jesus, alluding to the name which He had given him at the time He first met him (John i., 42), said, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock (the truth which thou hast uttered) I will build my Church." This is the only interpretation which will agree with the rest of God's word. St. Paul (1 Cor. iii., 11) said, "Other foundation can no man lay than that, which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Blot out that truth, that "Jesus is the Christ, the son of the living God," and what foundation would the Church have to rest upon? So (Eph. ii., 20) the Church is built "upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief corner stone." Exactly similar is the testimony of St. Peter (1 Peter ii., 3-6). The whole context confirms this view. And the Church of Rome has placed itself in a very awkward position, for it has laid down the principle

that no passage of Scripture is to be interpreted, except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers (see page 50). Now, the passage we are considering may rightly be called the very foundation of the claims of the Church of Rome. Therefore, if there is a single text in the Bible for which we may justly ask Romanists to produce the unanimous consent of the Fathers, surely this is the one. Well, Bellarmine ventured to assert, that the Fathers were unanimous in interpreting the passage as teaching, that the Church was founded on Peter. But in answer to this Launy, a celebrated Roman Catholic writer, replied, that sixteen Fathers and Doctors applied the words to Christ as the foundation of the Church; eight to the Church as founded on all the Apostles equally; whilst only seventeen held the modern Romish view; and of these *not one* derived the Pope's supremacy from that text. As an illustration, Cyprian and Jerome explain the text as referring to Peter personally. Basil says that it refers to all the Apostles equally. Ambrose, Hilary, and Chrysostom say that it refers to the confession made by Peter. Augustine says that it refers to Christ Himself. These are recognised as saints by the Church of Rome, but they give four different interpretations of the text. Therefore, according to Roman Catholic testimony, it is evident that the Fathers exercised their own judgment. And every wise man will do the same. for the Church of Rome has cut herself off from giving an opinion on the question. As we have seen, Pope Gregory the Great, in a very lengthened controversy, which practically involved this ques-

tion, *knew absolutely nothing about the Church being founded on Peter* (see pages 33 and 34).

We will now consider the other expressions. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." Romanists take this to mean that the Church would be infallible, and that the powers of hell would never prevail against it. But this is a strange interpretation. The Church has often been led into error. In Cent. iv., almost the whole Church adopted Arianism, and Pope Liberius subscribed the Arian Creed. Neither Church nor Pope were infallible. And touching the power of the enemy, gates were never made to go out and fight. They were simply intended to keep in those who ought not to come out, or to keep out those who ought not to enter. Then the word "Hades" does not mean hell, the abode of devils and evil spirits. It simply means "the unseen world," and is frequently used for the grave, as Abraham expressed it (Gen. xxiii., 4): "That I may bury my dead out of my sight." So the word "Hades" in this passage ought to be translated here as in Isaiah xxxviii., 10, "the gates of the grave." And the passage simply means, that they who are built upon Jesus as the Son of the Living God, shall have everlasting life; the grave will have no power to retain them.

Besides, if we could suppose that the gates of "Hades" meant the gates of hell, the abode of devils, the Romish interpretation would be contrary to the truth. For in Rev. xiii., 2, we read that the dragon (that old Serpent and Satan; Rev. xx., 2, compare 2 Thess. ii., 9) "gave his power and his throne and *great authority* to the seven-headed

beast (Rev. xiii., 7), and it was given him (the seven-headed beast) to make war with the saints, and to overcome them." Surely by "these saints" is meant the Church of God (Rom. i., 7., Phil. iv., 22). And the power which prevailed against the Church of God was the seven-headed beast, which we have before seen was the Church of Rome, and it was by fire and sword that it prevailed (as against the Huguenots, the Albigenes, the Waldenses, the Bohemians, the Lollards, etc.), till it had almost banished God's truth from the earth. A great part of the world still "wonders after the beast." "Wonders after" are emphatic and expressive words.

Next, "I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven." This is a figurative expression. I could hardly imagine anyone so simple as to think that there is a literal door to the entrance of Heaven, to be locked and unlocked. The language is exactly similar to Luke xi., 52: "Woe unto you, lawyers! Ye have taken away the key of knowledge: ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering ye hindered." Again, if Peter were to decide who was to enter Heaven and who not, he must have something like infinite knowledge to know the hearts of all men, and it would render it unnecessary that "all must appear before the judgment seat of Christ." It appears therefore clear that what Jesus really meant was, that Peter should have the privilege of making known what is necessary for salvation, and thus opening the way to Heaven. And Jesus therefore added, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be

bound in Heaven : and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." This was a very common way of speaking among the Jews to signify what may or may not be done. To bind signified to forbid, to loose to allow. Thus Jesus said, that the Pharisees bound heavy burdens, and laid them on men's shoulders, but they themselves would not touch them with one of their fingers, that is, they laid intolerable restrictions on others, but altogether disregarded them themselves. Dr. Lightfoot, the great Hebrew and Oriental scholar, says, that the use of the terms binding and loosing in this sense may be found thousands of times in Jewish writings. If so, no Jew could possibly misunderstand our Lord's words. They simply meant that Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, would be able to say what was forbidden and what was required or allowed in the Church (see pages 87 and 88 on John xx., 23).

We are now prepared to consider how the Evangelists and the Apostles themselves understood the words addressed to Peter. In the first place, if the Church was to be built on Peter, it would have been absolutely necessary that all Christians should know it. Now Mark viii., 27-33, and Luke ix., 18-22, have both given us an account of that conversation, though not so fully as St. Matthew. But it would be unreasonable to suppose that they would omit what was absolutely necessary for everyone to know, especially when we consider that for a very long time probably very few Churches would have more than one or two Gospels, for books could not be quickly or cheaply multiplied as in the present

day. Therefore those who had not the Gospel of St. Matthew would know nothing of the words which are supposed to confer the highest dignity on Peter, for both St. Mark and St. Luke omitted those words. But by recording Peter's answer to Jesus, "Thou art the Christ," or "the Christ of God," they recorded what was sufficient to signify that the Kingdom of *the Christ* (Messiah), that is, the Church, would be founded by and rest upon Jesus, that is, would be built upon Jesus as the rock (Gal. ii., 7 and 8).

Next, we may observe that all the twelve Apostles were present when Jesus spake these words. How did they understand them? Did they believe that Peter received any kind of supremacy? Such an idea never entered into the head of any one of them, for after that they appear to have been continually disputing which of them should be the greatest. Four such occasions have been recorded; the last was at the last supper. On one occasion they asked Jesus the plain question which of them should be the greatest. What was His reply? On each occasion He told them that there was to be no chief among them. Now, what truth or honesty could there be in this, if He had already stated that the Church was to be built on Peter? or that Peter was to have some power or privilege which the rest were not to have? *Rome's interpretation of those words* (Matt. xvi., 18) IS EQUIVALENT TO CALLING JESUS A LIAR AND HYPOCRITE!

Again, Romanists say that Jesus made Peter the chief Apostle when He thrice repeated the words, "Feed my sheep" (John xxi., 15-17). In the first

place, is it possible to believe that He made Peter the chief Apostle after he had distinctly said that there was to be no chief among them? But let us consider the case. On the evening before His crucifixion Jesus told His Disciples that they would all forsake Him. Peter protested, "Though all should forsake thee, yet will not I," thus professing that he loved Jesus more than the others. But Jesus said, "Before the cock crow thou wilt deny me thrice." Peter, however, was still confident. In the most solemn way Jesus warned him, "Simon, Simon, Satan hath desired that he might have *you* (all of you), but I have prayed for *thee* that *thy* faith fail not." Peter's self-confidence placed him in the greatest danger. He had further warnings in the garden of Gethsemane, yet three times he denied his Lord, and emphasised the denial with cursing and swearing. It is true that when Peter called to mind the words of Jesus, he went out and wept bitterly, but he might well fear that, after such warnings, he had fallen so terribly, he could never be *fully* forgiven; and the other Disciples might have the same fear. Therefore it was that Jesus said, "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these (my other Disciples)?" Peter could say, Lord thou knowest I love thee," but could not dare to say "more than these." Three times the question was asked, three times Peter answered, and three times he received the command, "Feed my sheep." Who is there that cannot see that this definitely referred to the three denials, and was the assurance of forgiveness? And who, except such as are led blindfold by the Church of Rome, could

believe that any kind of supremacy was thereby conferred on Peter? To feed the flock of Christ is the duty of every minister of the Gospel, so St. Paul told the elders (presbyters) of the Church of Ephesus (Acts xx., 28). So Peter himself calling himself *συμπρεσβυτερος* (1 Peter v., 1), a co-presbyter, bids the presbyters to "feed the Church of God." Nor was there after our Lord spake those words any trace of supremacy in Peter; on the contrary, "when the Apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John"; therefore, according to our Lord's words (John xiii., 16), Peter and John were not greater than the rest, for "He that is sent is not greater than he that sent him." Does the Pope ever submit to be sent on any business as Peter did? Next, when the Apostles and brethren heard that Peter had been to Cornelius, and eaten with him, "they contended with him." This is a clear proof that they had no idea of the supremacy or infallibility of Peter, neither had St. Paul; for when Peter was at Antioch, he would by his conduct through fear, as far as his influence went, have reduced the Church to a Jewish sect, so that St. Paul "withstood him to his face" (Gal. ii., 11-14). Lastly, at the Council at Jerusalem, about the reception of the Gentiles, Peter was present, but did not preside, but James did. And at the conclusion James summed up (Acts xv., 19), "Wherefore my sentence is," etc. And in the words of that sentence the decree was drawn up, and sent, not in the name of Peter, but in the name of the Apostles and elders. After that we have no

account of Peter. But it is very evident that Peter himself had no kind of supremacy, and therefore could transmit none to anyone else.

ROMISH IDEA OF A CHURCH.

Romanists say that Christ's purpose was to found a visible corporate Church under a visible head, to the teaching of which all are bound to submit, and out of which there can be no salvation. Of course, they mean their own Church, which they call Catholic. All this is contrary to the Scriptures. Romanists often say that Protestants must be wrong, because the word "Protestant" does not occur in the Bible. But we may turn round and say, Catholics must be wrong, since the word Catholic is not found in the Bible. But there is this difference between the two arguments, that though the word "Protestant" is not found in the Bible the thing itself is found. The word simply signifies one who protests against what is sinful and false, so that in a very correct sense Moses was a Protestant, so were the prophets, so was our Lord, and His Apostles; St. Paul found it necessary to protest against the conduct of St. Peter (Gal. ii., 14). On the other hand, neither the word Catholic nor that which Romanists mean by it is found in the Bible.

The word *ἐκκλησία* simply signifies an assembly, or congregation (Acts xix., 40). But when it refers to a number of persons, who meet to worship God, it is translated by the word Church. It is occasionally used exactly as we use the word Chris-

tians in such an expression as "Saul persecuted the Church." In Heb. xii., 23, it is used to express the true Church of Christ, as distinct from mere professors. But the almost universal use of the word is to express visible professing Churches, as the Church of Corinth, the Church of Thessalonica, the church in thy, or in his, house; or, in speaking of countries, the Churches of Judea, of Galatia, of the Gentiles. Now, the way that the word is thus used shows clearly that they were all independent Churches; there is not the slightest indication that any one Church was in any sense, or in any degree, subject to any other. And, as they professed to serve God, they might each be called "a Church, or *the Church of God*" (Acts xx., 28, 1 Cor. i., 2, xi., 22). And, if we wished to use an expression to include *them all*, we might rightly say, "the Catholic Church." But, if any should be excluded, that term would be wrong. But not one of the Churches mentioned in the New Testament ever had any connection with Rome, therefore the Church of Rome never was Catholic. The proper definition of the word is that of the Church of England, when we pray "for the Catholic Church, that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth." It is clear therefore that Christ did not come to establish a visible corporate Church, but "to save sinners" (1 Tim. i., 15). But no Church is saved. In the Church the tares and the wheat will grow together till the harvest, and man cannot separate them (Matt. xiii., 24-30). Church membership therefore cannot save us. Salvation is a personal matter requiring personal

union with Christ, as "branches of the true Vine," "Christ dwelling in the heart by faith."

Romanists persist in asserting that the Church, and not the Bible, was appointed to be our guide. A supposed proof of this is the fact that "the Church existed before a word of the New Testament was written." The inference drawn from this is, that as the Church existed then without the New Testament, so it could exist now, and therefore the New Testament is not wanted. Though I had heard in time past this argument, I should not now have thought it necessary to answer it, except that one, who has far more opportunities of knowing than I have, has just told me that it is a common argument. He could see the absurdity of it, but hardly knew how to meet it. The Church of Rome knows how to employ sophistry to throw dust into people's eyes.

It is true that there was a Church, or rather *many Churches*, before the New Testament was written. But there were Apostles before there was a Church. If, then, the Church should be preferred to the New Testament because of priority, for the same reason the Apostles must be preferred to the Church. The Church may, in truth, be said to have had its beginning on the day of Pentecost, when 3,000 souls were converted. In a certain sense, it may be said that there was a Church before that, for a Church, *ἐκκλησία*, simply means a congregation, and there was a congregation of Disciples assembled on the evening of the day of the Resurrection. But they did not understand anything about Salvation, for they all thought that Jesus was to be a great

King reigning over the house of Israel like David. The crucifixion had dispelled these hopes. But after the Resurrection their minds reverted into the old groove, as they asked Jesus (Acts i., 6): "Wilt thou now restore the Kingdom to Israel?" But He told them that they must wait till they had received the promised Holy Spirit, who would "teach them all things, and bring to their remembrance whatsoever He had said unto them" (John xiv., 26). The promise was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost. Having received the infallible Guide, the Apostles went forth preaching and establishing Churches. But the devil was not idle. He began to sow tares among the wheat (Matt. xiii., 25), corrupting the truth, and leading men astray. So the Holy Spirit moved the Evangelists to write the Gospels for the instruction of future ages. And St. Luke tells us that he wrote his Gospel and Acts of the Apostles in consequence of the falsehoods which were being propagated. So St. Paul wrote his Epistles, not only to confirm his own teaching, but to guard men against the false teaching which began to prevail in the Church. So it was with the Epistles of Peter, James and John. Yet the Romish argument implies that we ought to look to the Church, in which these errors prevailed, rather than to the divinely commissioned and inspired Apostles! And what makes the argument still more absurd is, that, whilst we may know everything that the Apostles taught, we cannot know one single fact about the Church, which existed before the New Testament was written, except what is found in the New Testament. That is our only source of information on the subject.

◦

But Romanists have sometimes a good word for the Bible, but it is the Bible interpreted by the Church, which means the Church and not the Bible. Now, this is directly opposed to the word of God. For example, we are very often warned against false teachers, but we are never once told to look to the Church for direction in such cases, nor, indeed, in any case of doubt. But we are constantly directed to the written word of God, which tells us, "the Holy Scriptures are able to make one wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus," and that "they are profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may *be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*" (2 Tim. iii., 15-17). Further, Jesus said that the Holy Spirit will be given to everyone who asks. And in 1 John ii., 20-27, we are told, that it is this gift of the Spirit alone, and not the Church, which can keep us from being seduced into error.

In Acts xx., 26 and 27, St. Paul said, "I am clean from the blood of all men, for I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God." But, if Church teaching is so necessary, how could he be thus clean? since neither in his recorded words nor in his letters has he said one word about it. Romanists would no doubt reply, as they certainly do, that he has mentioned it in 1 Tim. iii., 15, where we read, "the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth." But we may ask, did St. Paul in those words contradict his own teaching, and the teaching of the rest of the Scriptures? The

question suggests the necessity for examining the passage most carefully. Many Protestants have been stumbled at the difficulty, and no wonder. The words *as they stand* are vastly important to the Church of Rome. *As she claims to be the Church mentioned* (the note on the words in the R.C. Bible is, "the pillar and ground of the truth. Therefore the Church of the Living God can never uphold error, or bring in corruption, superstition or idolatry"). She claims therefore to be infallible. Now, the slight alteration that I suggest entirely upsets this theory. Therefore it will be necessary to give the most satisfactory reasons for the alteration. Let us then consider the case calmly and without prejudice.

I.—I would remind the reader that originally the Scriptures were not divided into chapters and verses, neither were there any stops.

II.—I would call attention to the EXACT position of the words "pillar and ground of the truth."

III.—I would observe that no interpretation of words can be correct unless it agrees with the context.

IV.—In translating, the idiom of language ought to be carefully observed.

In the first place, we may observe that the division into chapters and verses is of incalculable value in enabling us to refer to and find any passage that we want, but in some cases the division has been wrongly placed. Some of these have been corrected in the Revised Version; for example, 1 Cor. xi., 1, and 2 Cor. viii., 1, really belong to the previous chapters, and have been restored in the R.V.

to their proper place. Now, if words are taken from the sentence to which they belong, and added to a sentence to which they do not belong, the result cannot be satisfactory. To me Col. iii., 16, appears to be an example, where we read, "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly in all wisdom; teaching and admonishing one another in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." "In all wisdom" seems hardly required in the sentence where it is placed. But whoever thinks of teaching and admonishing by singing psalms and hymns? If anyone does think that that is the proper thing to do, let him, next time one of his friends goes wrong, go to him and admonish him by singing a psalm, and see what the effect would be. The fact is, admonishing requires great wisdom; to do it unwisely would be more likely to do harm than good. What is required is simply to put the stops in the proper place. "Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly; in all wisdom teaching and admonishing one another; in psalms and hymns and spiritual songs singing with grace in your hearts to the Lord." Having made these necessary remarks (as it seemed to me), let us go on to consider the case of "the pillar and ground of the truth" (1 Tim. iii., 15).

I.—In 1 Tim. iii., 14, we read, "These things I write unto thee." What are these things? Of course, the things that he had just written, of which the ink was not yet dry. St. Paul had left Timothy at Ephesus to watch over the interests of that Church in his absence; and, as appears from the

passage, he had reason for thinking that his return would be delayed beyond what he anticipated when he set out; he therefore wrote this letter: and in this chapter he told Timothy what conduct he ought to expect, and insist upon, in the case of those who were ordained, or to be ordained, as ministers of the Church, adding, "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long (I write them) that thou mayest know how they (not 'thou,' as in A.V. and R.C. Bible, nor 'men,' as in R.V.) ought to behave in the house of God, which is the Church of the Living God." From the beginning of the chapter to this point the subject is *conduct and nothing else*. And no more powerful argument could be urged than the fact, that they were ministers in the Church of the Living God.

Having finished his directions about conduct, the Apostle at once begins a perfectly different subject. He warns Timothy, and through him other Christians, that the Holy Spirit distinctly foretells that there would be a great Apostasy, and he very naturally begins by stating that from which the Apostasy would take place. Therefore from the point where the subject of conduct ends, the new subject, *which is purely doctrinal*, begins. And it is at this very point that the words "the pillar and the ground of the truth" come in. Now the question is, to which sentence do these words belong? To that which precedes, or to that which follows? Certainly not that which goes before, *for they have no reference to conduct*. They are, *in the strictest sense*, doctrinal, and therefore they belong to that

which follows. And not only so, they are the most important and essential part of the sentence.

Therefore "the pillar and ground of truth" cannot refer to the Church.

II.—Let us consider the idioms of languages, by which is meant the peculiar forms of expression which belongs to each language, and cannot be transferred into another language. Thus in St. Luke xvi., 6, we read "the unjust steward," and Luke xviii., 9, "the unjust Judge," but in the original Greek the words are "the stewards of injustice," "the judge of injustice." Such expressions, however, would be intolerable in English. Many other idiomatic expressions might be mentioned (pages 86 and 87), but now we have only to deal with one. I have frequently heard and read 1 Cor. xiii., 13, quoted thus, "Faith, hope and charity," and this I should call a perfectly correct translation, although the Apostle wrote, "faith, hope, charity." I call it a perfectly correct translation, because it perfectly expresses the Apostle's meaning in the common English idiom. But it would have been intolerable in Greek. He might have written in equally good Greek, "faith and hope and charity." When three nouns or adjectives come together in a sentence, the Greeks either omitted "and" altogether or put it between each; thus in Eph. v., 19, we read in Greek, "Psalms and hymns and spiritual songs." In Col. iii., 16, in Greek, "Psalms, hymns, spiritual songs." The Authorised English Version generally follows the Greek text. But in Matt. xvii., 1, the Greek is "Peter, James, John." In Gal. ii., 9, the Greek is,

“James and Cephas and John”; in this case the English translation very properly omits “and” before Cephas. So also in John xiv., 6, it very properly omits the first “and” from the Greek, “the way and the truth and the life.” There are many examples of the rule in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles. The first Epistle to Timothy begins with an example of each kind. In verse 2, “Grace, mercy, peace,” not “grace, mercy and peace.” In verse 13, “a blasphemer and a persecutor and injurious,” not “a blasphemer, a persecutor and injurious,” as would be most natural in English. There are other examples in the Epistle, but we will turn to iii., 15, the verse in question. In the first place I notice that in the Greek the definite article is omitted throughout the verse, except before the word “truth,” but in English is rightly supplied in four places, and therefore ought to be so in the fifth. The words would then be, “the house of God which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth.” Now the omission of “and” before “the pillar and the ground of the truth,” according to the rule and examples before given, clearly signifies that those words are not to be joined to “the Church of the Living God,” but are the beginning of a new sentence. This confirms the former conclusion. If St. Paul had intended the words to be joined to the previous sentence he would have written, “the Church of the Living God AND the pillar and the ground of the truth.”

III.—If “the pillar and the ground of the truth” had been omitted altogether, the previous sentence

would have been perfect, so that no one could possibly have suspected that anything needed to be added to it. But the following sentence would have suffered great loss.

IV.—Let us take another view. An entirely new subject ought properly to begin a new chapter. If, then, we join the words “the pillar and the ground of the truth” to that which goes before, *where they are not wanted*, we should have a new chapter on an entirely new subject beginning with “and,” which word would connect it with—*nothing*, for there would be nothing going before to which it could be joined.

Each of the foregoing arguments proves that “the Church” is not the pillar and the ground of the truth. But it is also to be particularly noticed, that the Church mentioned is none other than the Church of EPHESUS, the Church, the teaching (1 Tim. i., 3) and conduct of whose ministers Timothy was appointed to superintend, the same Church that is mentioned in verse 5: “If a man know not how to rule his own house, how shall he take care of the Church of God?” Imagine (if that be possible) the Apostle Paul warning Timothy not to ordain any man who was incapable of taking care of the Church of Rome or, as Romanists call it, the Catholic Church! But as it was Timothy’s duty to watch over what was taught in that Church, he would be more properly called “the pillar and the ground of the truth” than the Church which was under his care.

The whole passage will be more clear when written out as it ought to be. But first, let us see

how it stands in the R.C. Bible, "which is the Church of the Living God, the pillar and ground of the truth. And evidently great is the mystery of godliness, which was manifested in the flesh, was justified in the Spirit, appeared unto Angels, hath been preached unto Gentiles, is believed in the world, is taken up into glory. Now the Spirit manifestly saith that in the last times," etc., etc. The passage needs some explanation.

"Mystery of godliness." In the Rheims translation, as originally published, this was "Sacrament of piety," not very intelligible, but was altered, as many other passages were, by adopting the Protestant Authorised translation. Yet they kept "which," the Latin "*quod*," instead of the Greek $\delta\varsigma$, "who," or "He who." Thus it is the mystery, which was manifested in the flesh. How this could be, or how it could be "received up in glory," is hard to understand. The word mystery in the New Testament signifies something that has been divinely made known, a revelation; but $\epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\lambda\alpha$ (without the article), godliness, as a feeling, sentiment, experience, a life or practice, cannot be the subject of a mystery or revelation, but with the article, as in this case, it refers to something very definite, "the object of our worship," as in Acts xvii., 23, $\delta\ \epsilon\nu\sigma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon$, "that which ye worship." Thus the Apostle's words properly translated would be "great is the mystery or revelation of the object of our worship," corresponding with "the mystery of Christ" in Col. i., 27, iv., 3. And the revelation of Jesus, as "the Christ the Son of the Living God," is the

greatest and most important of all revelations (Matt. xvi., 17).

"Justified in the Spirit" should be "by the Spirit." The word frequently has that meaning in the New Testament, as in Matt. xxvi., 25, *ἐν μάχαιρῃ*, by the sword. So Mark xii., 36, *ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ*, by the Holy Spirit.

"Appeared unto (was seen by) Angels" is a needless expression, for if the angels are ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation (Heb. i., 14), all the heirs of salvation, with all their surroundings, are seen by angels. The Greek word *angelos* (angel) simply means a messenger, as those sent by John (Luke vii., 24) are called "angels." "Seen by angels" therefore simply means, that the Apostles (Apostle also signifies a messenger) were witnesses of what they had seen and heard. This was most important (Acts i., 8, xxvi., 16, 2 Peter i., 16, 1 John i., 1). The importance of the united testimony of the Holy Spirit and of the Apostles is stated by our Lord in John xv., 26-27: "The Spirit of truth which proceedeth from the Father, He shall bear witness of me, and ye also shall bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."

There is only one more point to be noticed. "Now the Spirit manifestly saith." For "now" the Vulgate rightly has "autem" "but," which the Rheims, professedly following the Vulgate, rendered "and," a meaning which that word never had. Afterwards the R.C. Bible changed this into "now" by copying the Protestant Bible. The common meaning, however, of the Greek *δὲ* is "but," and in this case it is important. The passage is equivalent to say-

ing that the testimony to the truths of the Gospel is perfect, BUT, notwithstanding this, the Spirit signified that there would be a great departure from the faith. We may now look at the whole passage as it ought properly to be translated.

“These things I write unto thee” (concerning the conduct of Bishops or presbyters and deacons) that thou mayest know how they ought to behave in the house of God, which is the Church of the Living God.

The pillar and the ground of the truth (and confessedly great is the revelation of the object of our worship) is “He who was manifested in the flesh, justified by the Spirit, seen by His messengers, preached among the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up in glory. But the Spirit distinctly saith that in the latter days some will depart from the faith.”

From this, in which not a single letter or mark written by the Apostle has been omitted or changed, it is evident that “the pillar and the ground of the truth” is the Lord Jesus Christ, and this is the constant teaching of the Scriptures. From which also it is evident that the Church of Rome founds her claim to infallibility on words, which stand at the head and form the most important part of a passage containing a prophecy, which condemns her as the great Apostasy (see pages 42-48).

This infallibility, however, has proved to be a true “*ignis fatuus*,” eluding all attempts to catch it or locate it. Sometimes it was said to be located in the Pope, sometimes in the unanimous consent of the Bishops, sometimes in a general council, but

it was always absent when most wanted. I remember a Romish priest, when confronted with the immoral lives of some of the Popes, and how some Popes had treated others as heretics, replying, that it was nothing but a Protestant slander to say, that the Church believed in the infallibility of the Pope. He did not believe it, nor did he know anyone who did believe it. Now, if that priest lived but a few years longer he learnt that this "Protestant slander" had become an article of faith in his own Church, for, in 1870, in a Council in Rome, the Pope was declared to be infallible. That decree was doubtless very hard upon those who before could be good Catholics without believing in Papal Infallibility by compelling them to believe, or profess to believe, what their consciences utterly rejected.

Take as an example of the absence of infallibility, "The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary." There had been for several centuries a growing tendency towards this doctrine, but the real controversy may be said to have commenced when, in 1131, St. Bernard reproved the Canons of Lyons for having introduced the unauthorised festival into their Cathedral. The discussion thus raised led to a protracted controversy. As time advanced the conflict of opinion became more marked. At first it was rather as to the meaning of the words. It was allowed that she was perfectly free from sin from her birth, like Jeremiah (Jer. i., 6) and John the Baptist (Luke i., 25). But, as is invariably the case in an age of ignorance and superstition, the marvellous is always more acceptable than the simple truth, so it was in this case, the marvellous gradu-

ally won its way. In 1307, Duns Scotus, before the University of Paris, maintained the doctrine of the immaculate conception in its highest sense, and the Franciscans, to which order he belonged, went with him. But the Dominicans resolutely denied the doctrine. The opposition became very bitter. In 1470, Pope Sextus IV. imposed on both sides the obligation of mutual toleration and charity, but in vain. In 1483, he renewed the decree of obligation, but to no purpose. The conflict continued to increase. All that the Council of Trent could do was to reaffirm the constitution of Sextus IV. This, instead of bringing peace, only led to a renewal of the dispute, so that towards the end of the sixteenth century, Pius V. prohibited each side from calling the other heretics, and forbade all public discussion on the subject, except before learned theologians. Gregory XV. added further restriction upon the discussion of the subject, and ordered that no one should introduce into any prayer or formulary of the Church any other word than "conception" without adding any epithet involving either doctrine. Alexander VII. and Clement IX. added new solemnities to the festival. Clement XI. made it a holiday of obligation. Gregory XVI. permitted the word immaculate to be introduced into the service. And finally, in 1854, the doctrine of "the immaculate conception" was defined to be the doctrine of the Church of Rome; and we may now say that it is one of the most important (if not the most important) doctrine of that Church. Now, it appears to me an impossibility even to imagine that so bitter a dispute could have continued even for a few years,

much less for hundreds of years, if there had been any infallibility in the Church, and that it should be left till A.D. 1854 before it was finally settled. But numberless proofs might be given that the Church of Rome is not "the pillar and ground of the truth."

As the advocates of the Church of Rome assume that Christ intended to establish a visible corporate Church under a visible head, which of course means the Church of Rome, so every promise to the Church of God in the Bible is claimed for that Church to the exclusion of all others. But whatever does not suit their purpose they willingly overlook. As an example, take our Lord's last commission to His Disciples (Matt. xxviii., 18-20): "All power is given unto me in Heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The first part they regard as a command to establish one visible Catholic Church—the Romish. And therefore the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," they take as a promise and pledge of the perpetual presence of our Lord in their Church. Thus they claim to have a perpetual divine presence, teaching and guiding the Church from the days of the Apostles to the present time. The note in the Douay Bible on the last three verses of St. Matthew's Gospel is (verse 18, etc.), "All power," etc. See here the warrant and commission of the Apostles

and their successors, the Bishops and pastors of Christ's Church. He received from His Father all power in Heaven and in earth; and in virtue of this power He sends them (even as His Father sent Him; John xx., 21) to teach and disciple, *μαθητεύσατε*, not one, but all nations; and instruct them in all truths; and that He may assist them effectually in the execution of this commission He promises to be with them, not for three or four hundred years only, but all days, even to the consummation of the world. How, then, could the Catholic Church ever go astray: having always with her pastors, as is here promised, Christ Himself, who is "the way, the truth and the life"? (St. John xiv). This is very plausible and likely to deceive such as fail to observe the false assumptions on which the whole argument rests.

First.—It is assumed, though not definitely stated, that the Bishops and pastors of the Church of Rome (which is here first called Christ's Church and afterwards the Catholic Church) are the sole successors of the Apostles. In Part V. it will be shown that the Pope and Bishops of Rome are not the successors of Peter, and with regard to other Churches see page 191. The next assumption is, that the promise was made only to that Church, which is subject to the Pope, falsely called Catholic. Then it is assumed that that promise unconditionally secures Christ's presence, His protection and guidance. They overlook the fact that many similar promises were made in the Old Testament to the Israelites, that God would dwell among them, that He would be their God, and that they would be

His people, that He would circumcise their hearts to love the Lord their God with all their hearts and with all their souls, etc. How, then, it might be asked, could they possibly go astray? They did, however, go astray most terribly. Yet the Church of Rome having, by the foregoing assumptions, secured (?) the perpetual presence of Christ with her pastors, and thereby the infallibility of all her priests (for, according to her own reasoning, how could they be otherwise than infallible, "having always Christ with them" ?), concluded that her teaching is, and always has been, free from error—even during the time when nearly all the Church with the Pope lapsed into Arianism, page 184—and during the time when the Popes Gregory II., Gregory III., and Adrian established the worship of images, page 62—and during the time of the grossest moral corruption and ignorance of divine things, when religion was almost extinct according to the testimony of her own writers, Baronius, Bellarmine, etc., pages 70-72—and during the hundreds of years of the bitter controversy about the immaculate conception, etc. They willingly shut their eyes to the fact that the promised presence of Christ, like the forementioned promises of the Old Testament, was conditional—the condition being that they "teach the observance of all things whatsoever He commanded." In Matt. xxviii., 20, the promise follows, and is dependent on, the fulfilment of that condition. Therefore, before the Church of Rome can claim a divine presence, she must prove, not assume, that she teaches all things that Christ commanded. But it has been proved that, in almost

everything, she teaches the very opposite. Her claim therefore is an empty boast.

On the other hand, every Church that does so teach may rejoice in the assurance that Christ, according to His promise, is verily and indeed present among them. It may be but a little Church—a little flock (Luke xii., 32), despised by man—there may be but two or three gathered together in His name, yet He is of a truth in the midst of them (Matt. xviii., 20). They have that which the Church of Rome lacks, but loudly boasts of being the sole possessor.

PART IV.

WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?

I.—TRADITIONS.

THE Church of Rome claims St. Peter as its founder and first Bishop, and holds that the Pope is his successor and the head of the whole Christian Church. This belief rests entirely on tradition. There are different traditions, which the Church of Rome has accepted, and on which Romanists rely.

I.—Irenæus says: "The blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, having founded and established the Church of Rome, appointed Linus to the Episcopate."

II.—Tertullian said that Peter appointed Clemens Bishop of Rome.

III.—Eusebius' Chronicle said that Peter first founded the Church of Antioch, and then went to Rome, where he founded the Church, and continued as the first Bishop for twenty-five years, till his death.

IV.—There is a tradition that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome under the Emperor Nero.

These traditions, from the time of their origin, have been quoted from age to age, and, as time advanced, with various additions. And what is most strange, these quotations are brought forward to prove, not simply the existence of the traditions, which would be quite right, but the truth of the traditions; and when skilfully grouped, and enforced by an eloquent pleader, they look like a formidable argument, and many regard them as unanswerable. But what do they amount to? As proofs of the truth of the traditions they are in fact worthless.

II.—HOW TRADITION SHOULD BE EXAMINED.

As an example, if some Cardinal should quote the words of a man who died a hundred years ago relating certain historical, or supposed historical, facts, would that quotation prove that the story of those facts was true? Certainly not. Whether he believed it or not would make no difference in the actual truth or untruth of the story. The fact that he quoted it might be given as a proof that he believed it, and that would be all. Another might read the story and have good reason for believing it to be false. And if ten thousand writers should hereafter follow the example of that Cardinal, their united testimony could not add the slightest weight as proof to the truth of the story, but would be an undoubted proof that such a story existed in their day. For a lie could never be changed into truth

by the number of persons who believed and quoted it. But if anyone wished to know the truth, the proper and only way would be to go to the fountain head, and enquire about the first writer of the story. Was he an eye-witness or contemporary of the facts recorded? If not, what means had he of obtaining information? Is there any evidence of his being a faithful and judicious writer, or otherwise? And above all, does his account agree, or can it be reconciled, with the account given by those who were eye-witnesses or contemporary with the facts? But if this would be the most satisfactory way of discovering the truth in the case supposed, surely the same mode of proceeding would be the most satisfactory in examining the traditions under discussion. I would assume, that whenever the Fathers quote a writing or tradition, they quote with sufficient accuracy, and fairly represent the traditions as they existed in their own day; but they are not responsible for the truth of what they quote, but simply for their own opinion about it. But if a tradition be proved to be untrue in the beginning, it would be a waste of time to examine their quotations, because these could never make it worthy of credit.

III.—THE TRADITION OF IRENÆUS.

THE first person, as far as we know, who mentions Peter in connection with Rome, was Irenæus. He said that Peter and Paul, having founded and established the Church of Rome, appointed Linus

to the ministry of the Episcopate. Epiphanius, as a natural interpretation of these words, treats of St. Peter and St. Paul as joint Bishops of Rome, *οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἀουτὶ καὶ ἐπίσκοποι*.

Let us then examine this tradition in the way before pointed out. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons from A.D. 177 to 202. We may therefore conclude, that what he said about the two Apostles was written more than one hundred years after their death, and therefore considerably more than one hundred years after the supposed facts which he relates.

How, or by what means, did he obtain his information? This he did not state. Therefore we can only consider possibilities or probabilities. Perhaps it may be said, that he received it from those who were well and accurately informed; but this we shall see could not have been the case.

St. Luke tells us that the reason why he wrote his Gospel was because many had undertaken to give an account of what Christians believed about our Lord (Luke i., 1-4; Acts i., 1), but their accounts were not to be relied on. And these traditions and fables continued to increase and multiply after the time of St. Luke. And such as have come down to us are exceedingly foolish and objectionable. And as it was with our Lord, so with respect to the Apostles and others mentioned in the Gospels. Some of the traditions may have contained some truth, some were improbable, foolish, or impossible. By the time of Irenæus there must have been many traditions, which, since they were not recorded, have perished. There may have been among these

last traditions some about Peter. Be that as it may, Irenæus recorded one tradition. Is there any reason to believe that it is true?

Was Irenæus a judicious writer? He was, I am convinced, a very good man, but not always judicious. For example, he said, that our Lord was fully fifty years old when he was crucified, which is certainly untrue. Now, if he could accept a tradition about our Lord that was not true, would it be at all astonishing to find that he had accepted a tradition about the Apostles which was also untrue?

We are now to enquire, "Does the tradition about the Apostles agree with contemporary records?" Most decidedly not. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, tells us that there is not one word of truth in it, and the Acts of the Apostles fully confirms St. Paul's words. Twice in that letter he tells us that he had never been near Rome (i., 13, xv., 22-24). Therefore Peter and Paul had nothing to do with the founding of the Church of Rome, or appointing a Bishop there.

But we may say that the Church of Rome has, in no small measure, pinned her faith and her infallibility on this tradition. For, though but little is said about the Episcopacy of St. Paul, there is good reason for it. Paul must, in this respect, be kept in the background, or the supremacy of Peter would be in danger. Irenæus puts them on an equality, but if Paul be equal with Peter, why may not James and John and the other Apostles be equal also? But on the strength of this tradition the Pope still claims the authority of both Peter and

Paul (page 204). As to the truth of the tradition, Romanists seem to have no doubt. Thus in a course of lectures delivered in Manchester a few years ago, in reply to the Bishop of Manchester, Father Bernard Vaughan, S.J., brother of Cardinal Vaughan, said: "St. Peter founded the Church of Rome with his colleague St. Paul. So Irenæus told them. Surely, that is enough." No doubt that is enough for the Church of Rome. And if accepted it would be enough to silence St. Paul for ever. So Romanists will go on quoting this worthless tradition, as if Irenæus knew more about St. Paul than Paul himself knew.

IV.—THE TRADITION OF TERTULLIAN.

THE next tradition is that of Tertullian, who was a contemporary of Irenæus, but survived him some years. He tells us that Peter appointed Clemens Bishop of Rome. This tradition is also received by the Church of Rome. Tertullian knew nothing of Linus, or of his successor Cletus, though, according to tradition, Linus was Bishop of Rome A.D. 66, Cletus A.D. 78, and Clemens A.D. 91. But as Peter *by tradition* is said to have been crucified A.D. 68, the ordination of Clemens by Peter labours under the great difficulty of being twenty-three years after the death of Peter! How is this difficulty overcome? Father Vaughan said: "As for the great difficulty that Peter could not well ordain Clemens twenty-three years after his own death, they acknowledged the difficulty of course, but explained

(what cannot the Church of Rome explain) with Platina, that there was such a thing possible as, not ordaining, but bequeathing the right of succession by will to a Bishop already ordained." But this "Will" must have included Cletus also, and, if we have regard to the true date of St. Peter's death (see page 176), *if he died at Rome*, A.D. 64, it must have included Linus also. Truly it was a remarkable "Will." Is it not remarkable that Peter should appoint his three next successors, with an interval of two years between his own death and the date of the succession of the first? But how did Platina, who lived in the fourteenth century, know anything about St. Peter's "Will"? And whoever dreamed that St. Peter did make a "Will"? In history, chronology holds a most important place, but the Church of Rome can, when occasion requires, set chronology at defiance. Thus the Bishop of Manchester had said, that not a single Father of the first four centuries could be quoted to prove that the Bishop of Rome inherited the supremacy, except one, the Pope Siricius. To this Father Vaughan replied, that "they objected altogether to being bound by the arbitrary limitation imposed on history by his Lordship. Their guide was the living Church, alike of the present and of the past." Of course, on this principle, Platina's evidence about St. Peter's will, though 1,300 years after date, renders it historically true, because the Church sanctions it. And the testimony of Father Vaughan, as a member of the living Church, though more than 1,800 years after date, without any evidence, is equally satisfactory!

V.—THE CHRONICLE OF EUSEBIUS.

WE now turn to the tradition that Peter first founded the Church of Antioch, and then went to Rome, where he founded the Church, and there continued as Bishop for twenty-five years, till his death. This tradition was found in the Chronicle of Eusebius, who lived in the beginning of the fourth century. That chronicle no longer exists; but Father Vaughan laboured to prove (what no one doubted) that it did once exist, and that it contained this tradition, as is proved by the extracts found in subsequent writers. And after he had mentioned a translation made in the ninth century, which had preserved this very passage, he said that it was very interesting and important in this enquiry, by which, of course, he would mean, that it proved the truth of the tradition. Well, it is very interesting and important as another proof of the folly of depending on tradition.

If we turn to Acts xi., 19-26, we read that some of those who were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen went to Antioch preaching the Gospel. And the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number turned to the Lord. When tidings of these things came to the ears of the Church, which was in Jerusalem, they sent forth Barnabas, that he should go as far as Antioch, who, when he was come and had seen the grace of God, was glad "Then departed Barnabas to Tarsus to seek for Saul, and when he had found him, he brought him to Antioch. And it came to pass that a whole year they as-

sembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people." So the Church of Antioch was founded, but Peter had absolutely nothing to do with it. What, then, becomes of the tradition that Peter founded the Church of Rome after he had founded the Church of Antioch?

VI.—FURTHER CONDEMNATION OF THE TRADITION.

THERE are several other circumstances connected with Antioch which tell against tradition, and the claims of the Church of Rome. Though our Lord had given the command to preach the Gospel to all nations, ten years had passed since our Lord's ascension, and nothing had been done to fulfil that command. It seems that the Apostles, as well as others, thought that He only meant Jews scattered among all nations. Peter had been sent a short time before by a thrice repeated vision to Cornelius, and when he heard how Cornelius had been directed to send for him, he said: "Now I perceive that God is no respecter of persons." But what prevented him from seeing this before? Jewish prejudice. Still, nothing further was done for the Gentiles. The work was first begun at Antioch by some unknown persons from Cyprus and Cyrene (Acts xi., 20), and God greatly blessed their labours. Now, when the Church thus founded at Antioch heard of the famine in Judea, they sent help to the poor brethren by the hands of Barnabas and Saul (Acts xi., 30). Here the narrative is interrupted by the account of Peter's imprisonment

by Herod. Occurring as this break in the narrative does, it emphasises two important facts against tradition. First, that Peter could not possibly have had anything to do with Antioch. Second, that he was not in Rome, as tradition says that he was at this very time, A.D. 44 (see page 190).

VII.—THE DOCTRINE ON WHICH THE CHURCH OF ROME ENTIRELY DE- PENDS DISCREDITED.

WHEN Paul and Barnabas had fulfilled thir mission at Jerusalem, they returned to Antioch. Now, as Jerusalem was the acknowledged residence of the Apostles (Acts xi., 1 and 2, xv., 2; Gal. i., 18., ii., 1 and 2), Barnabas and Saul must have had at least several interviews with the Apostles; but they received no commission or ordination through the Apostles. But as soon as they returned to Antioch, they were set apart and ordained by the direction of the Holy Spirit to the office of preaching the Gospel to the Gentiles, by the laying on of the hands of the preachers and teachers of Antioch. Surely, if the doctrine of "Apostolical succession" had been worth anything, their ordination would have been by the hands of the Apostles. But the way in which the ordination by the hands of the Apostles was passed over, and given to the hands of others, appears to have been by anticipation a condemnation of the doctrine of Apostolical succession, which has been the curse of the Church by fostering priestly pride and assumption, etc., and is the very foundation of Papal and Ritualistic claims.

VIII.—WHICH CHURCH IS THE MOTHER OF ALL THE CHURCHES?

WE are next told that the Disciples were first called Christians at Antioch (Acts xi., 26). Now, it may be observed, that the name was not adopted by the Church in the time of the Apostles. It was not once used by St. Paul, St. James, St. John, or St. Jude. It is once used by St. Peter, and only quoted by him as a term of reproach, as a charge brought against the Disciples, for which they had to suffer (1 Peter iv., 16). It might seem strange therefore that Luke should record where and when the name was first used. Why did he record this? Because he was moved to do so by the Holy Spirit. It was an important fact. It was the fulfilment of a prophecy, that when the Gentiles were admitted into the Church it would receive a new name (Isaiah lxii., 2): "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness, and all kings thy glory; and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." And, again, Isaiah lxx., 1 and 2 and 15, of which verses St. Paul (Rom. x., 20 and 21) says, that 1 and 2 refer to the rejection of the Jews and the call of the Gentiles; and verse 15 tells us that, when that change would take place, the Church would be called by another name. Accordingly the word used in Acts xi., 26, is not the word commonly employed to express the giving of a name, but distinctly signifies "Called of God." It is used in eight other passages, and in each case signifies divine instruction. In Matt. ii., 12, "warned of God" (Theophylact on Matt. ii., 12,

explains χρηματίζεσθαι by παρά Θεοῦ ἀποκάλυψιν, "to receive a revelation from God"). Luke ii., 26, "it was revealed." Acts x., 22, "was warned from God." Hebrew viii., 5, "was admonished of God;" xi., 7, "warned of God;" xii., 25, R.V., "that warned them on earth." Rom. vii., 3, "shall be called by the law of God" (see verse 1); xi., 4, "what saith the answer of God?" Therefore the word in Acts xi., 26, may very correctly be translated "called Christians by the mouth of the Lord," according to Isaiah lxii., 2, though first pronounced by an enemy. The Church of Rome absurdly assumes the title of "The mother of all the Churches." But Rev. xvii., 5, says, that she is the "Mother of harlots." But if any Church could claim the title, "The mother of all the Churches," it would undoubtedly be the Church of Antioch. There the Gospel was first preached to the Gentiles, and there the Church received its divinely appointed name, and from thence the first preachers to the Gentiles were sent forth by the Holy Spirit. Thus the new name was given at the very time and the very place of the appointing of the first Apostles to the Gentiles, that is, at the very time and place of the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah. We have seen that the word used by St. Luke expresses inspiration. He must be blind, indeed, who, observing this agreement, fails to recognise that it is of God, and that the Scriptures were inspired of God.

But not only were the first preachers to the Gentiles sent forth from Antioch, but after each missionary journey the Apostles returned to Antioch;

222 WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?

and when they had called the Church together, related all that God had done with them, and had opened the door of faith unto the Gentiles.

Thus Antioch was the centre from which the Gospel was sent to the Gentile world, and so might rightly be called the mother of all the Gentile Churches, and, in fact, of all Churches, since there is now no separate Jewish Church. In the South of India there is a remarkable confirmation of this. There exists there to the present day a Christian Church called the Syrian Church. Tradition says that St. Thomas went to India, but there may be no more truth in this than in the traditions about Peter. Be this as it may, it is certain that they who founded the Church in South India were members of the Syrian Church, for they taught their converts to regard themselves as members of the Syrian Church. And to the present day they look to Antioch as the Mother Church. Romanists may make light of these things, but we may imagine, if these things could have been said of Rome, how they would have brought them forward as unanswerable proofs that the Pope was the head of the whole Christian world. And the argument would have been far better than anything they can now produce. As it is, they all tell strongly against the claims of the Church of Rome and Papal authority.

IX.—THE TRADITIONAL DEATH OF PETER AND PAUL.

Now I turn to the tradition that Peter and Paul

were put to death in the persecution under Nero. The Roman historian Tacitus tells us that the Emperor Nero set fire to and destroyed a considerable part of Rome. Then to escape the charge of having done it, he accused and began a savage persecution of Christians, of whom, Tacitus says, that an immense multitude perished by the most frightful tortures. But Tacitus says that nothing, that Nero could do, could clear him from the stigma of having caused the fire.

According to Tacitus (*Annals*, Bk. xv., c. 41), the conflagration began on the fourteenth day before the Kalends of July, A.U.C. 817, during the consulship of Caius Loecanius and Marcus Licinius, that is, on the 15th day of June, A.D. 64, and the persecution began soon after. We will take the case of Paul first. He arrived in Rome, as a prisoner, in the spring of 62, and was detained for two whole years. He was therefore set at liberty, and left Rome in the spring (probably towards the end of April or in May) of 64, that is, a very short time before the persecution began. Without any evidence therefore we might conclude that he would not return to Rome. It would have been a mark of insanity to do so. But it will be shown by clear evidence that he never did return to Rome. Therefore with regard to his death tradition is false.

We will now turn to Peter. We have the direct testimony of Paul that Peter was not in Rome during Paul's two years' imprisonment (see page 190), and there is not the shadow of evidence that he went to Rome after that time, not even tradition. For tradition always places his going to Rome at

a much earlier date. St. Paul's words therefore, in reality, contradict the tradition about St. Peter's death.

But we might reasonably conclude that, if Peter had been in Rome, he would, as the founder and Bishop of the Church, have been one of the first to suffer. And this was certainly the opinion of the man who *invented* the following tradition: "When the persecution began, Peter fled from Rome. But as he was going he met Jesus, and asked Him where He was going. Jesus replied that He was going to Rome to suffer again, as Peter was afraid of suffering. Upon this Peter turned back to Rome, and was crucified with his head downwards, at his own request, as he felt unworthy to suffer like his Lord." This tradition is accepted by the Church of Rome (page 190), and is sometimes said to be a very beautiful tradition. I should call it a very silly fable. If St. Peter were fleeing from persecution, he was only doing as His Lord directed (Matt. x., 23). On various occasions Paul fled from persecution, as from Damascus, from Jerusalem, from Thessalonica, from Beroea. If we had anything like a life of Peter, we should no doubt find that he had done the same. We know that he did so once by the help of an angel. Further, the tradition would make Jesus a false prophet. He said (John xxi., 18 and 19), that when Peter was old he would be bound and carried where he would not wish; the tradition says that he was dealt with exactly as he did wish.

St. Peter's death is said, without any evidence except tradition, which is worthless, to have been in

A.D. 68. But if he had been in Rome he would have been put to death in A.D. 64. Clemens was not Bishop of Rome till A.D. 91, that is, twenty-seven years after what would have been the time of Peter's death. Next, if Peter were crucified at the beginning of the persecution, A.D. 64, according to the tradition just mentioned (and there is not the shadow of reason why his execution would be delayed), after twenty-five years of residence in Rome, he must have arrived in Rome A.D. 39. And his imprisonment in Jerusalem was during his fifth year of residence in Rome, and thirteen years of that residence was during the time that the Acts of the Apostles shows that he never left Palestine! For he was at the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 52. Which are we to believe, tradition or St. Luke?

X.—THE DEATH OF PETER AND PAUL NOT KNOWN IN ROME.

By far the most important writing after the Apostles is the Epistle of Clemens. It was not written in the name of Clemens, but in the name of the Church of Rome. It was so highly valued by the primitive Church that it was publicly read like the Holy Scriptures. Now, there must have been many among them who could remember that terrible persecution under Nero. Therefore, if Peter had been the founder and Bishop of the Church, and had been put to death in that persecution, they must have known all this. And it

Q

seems to me that it would have been impossible for them to have passed over these things in silence. And if Clemens had been ordained by Peter, he must have been on most intimate terms of friendship with him; and if Peter had been so put to death, Clemens could not have been ignorant of or silent about it. Yet not one of these things is mentioned, or in the slightest degree alluded to, though the subject of the letter was such that, if Clemens had been the head of the whole Church, he ought, as Peter's successor, however gently and mildly, to have spoken with authority.

The above becomes the more remarkable when it is observed that allusion was made to St. Paul's *supposed* labours after his departure from Rome. It was said that he preached in the East, and to the bounds of the West, before he departed from this world to go to the Holy Place. But not a word was said about the time, place, or manner of his death. They evidently knew nothing about St. Paul's movements. I would ask, then, is it credible? Is it probable? Is it possible that they could have mentioned that, of which they had but a very vague and uncertain supposition—a mere inference from Rom. xv., 28 (an inference which, as will be proved, was absolutely false)—whilst they made not the slightest allusion to those things of which, if true, they must have had the most perfect knowledge, and things which would have afforded them a far weightier argument and illustration? The necessary conclusion is that they knew absolutely nothing of the death of either Peter or Paul, or of either of them having been Bishop of Rome.

XI.—THE LATTER YEARS OF ST. PAUL'S LIFE.

THE Epistle of Clemens suggests an enquiry into the latter years of the life of St. Paul. This enquiry is most interesting in itself, and may be somewhat necessary, because the second Epistle to Timothy is supposed to prove that Paul was a second time prisoner in Rome, and died in the persecution under Nero. And Peter and Paul seem inseparably joined by *tradition*, so that if tradition about Paul be false, that alone would be strong evidence against the traditions about Peter.

St. Paul's supposed journey to the West, mentioned in the Epistle of Clemens, may have been assumed from the fact, that in his Epistle to the Romans he expressed his intention of going by Rome to Spain. It might therefore have been supposed that he ultimately did go to Spain, which might be expressed in general terms as going to the bounds of the West. But during the time which elapsed (about five or six years) between the writing of that letter and the end of the two years' imprisonment, circumstances occurred which completely changed his purpose. Towards the end of his imprisonment he expressed to the Philippians his expectation of being able soon to visit them again. And he asked Philemon, who lived at Colosse, to prepare him a lodging. And no doubt he did visit those towns and neighbourhood. Now, though we cannot tell how long he was spared to preach the Gospel, it certainly appears to have been for some years; nor can we follow his steps

228 *WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?*

in exact order, yet we may form a good idea of some parts of his journeys from his Epistles.

Without attempting anything like chronological order, I would point out that after his release from Rome he went for the first time to Crete. His work in that large island would doubtless occupy considerable time. He would hardly have gone so far out of his way unless he intended to remain some time there. When he departed from that island he left Titus to carry on the work. After some time he wrote his Epistle to Titus, in which he said: "When I shall send Artemus to thee, or Tychicus, be diligent to come to me to Nicopolis, for I have determined there to winter" (Titus iii., 12). There were a number of towns called by that name, therefore we cannot tell which was meant. At a later period we learn that Titus was in Dalmatia (2 Tim. iv., 10), probably sent by Paul from Nicopolis. Of St. Paul's high opinion of Titus as a faithful worker in the Gospel see 2 Cor. ii., 13. St. Paul also visited Ephesus, where he no doubt spent some time. On his former visit he had spent a longer time there than in any other place. When he had ended this visit, he left Timothy there whilst he went into Macedonia. This was certainly after his two years' imprisonment in Rome, for before that time he had only once passed from Ephesus to Macedonia; and on that occasion, so far from leaving Timothy in Ephesus, he actually sent before him Timothy and Erastus to Macedonia whilst he himself stayed in Ephesus for a season (Acts xix., 22).

But on this occasion he left Timothy to watch

over the Church at Ephesus in his absence, and especially to charge certain persons not to teach false doctrines (1 Tim. i., 3). The last time St. Paul had seen the elders of that Church, he had expressed a fear that some of them would "speak perverse things to draw away disciples after them" (Acts xx., 30). If he found again the same cause for fear (1 Tim. i., 3, rather suggests that there was such cause), he might well leave his faithful companion, and beloved son in the faith, to supply his place during his absence. It is certain that he did intend to return to Ephesus after his Macedonian journey, for he wrote, "Till I come, give attendance to reading, to exhortation, to doctrine" (1 Tim. iv., 13). What length of time this journey occupied cannot be known, but it would be much longer than he had anticipated when he set out, for he gives this as the reason why he wrote this letter (1 Tim. iii., 14 and 15): "These things I write unto thee, hoping to come to thee shortly. But if I tarry (as is probable) I write them that thou mayest know how," etc. Clearly he would not have thought it necessary to write unless he had anticipated some delay. That Paul did return to Ephesus after the Macedonian journey, and probably ended his days in that neighbourhood, will be shown from his second Epistle to Timothy.

XII.—THE SECOND EPISTLE TO TIMOTHY.

It is generally believed that this Epistle was written

in Rome, and that in iv., 6-8, St. Paul expressed his anticipation of death under Nero. It seems to me strange that anyone who carefully reads the letter could for one moment accept this view. But it is the traditional opinion. It has been traditionally received that Paul died in Rome, and, as no other place of his death was known, without sufficient weighing of the evidence, this Epistle has been accepted as confirming the tradition. It is one illustration of the ease with which traditions are received, so that we must not be too hard upon Romanists for their faith in traditions, who have been brought up to reverence them. But everything in this letter proves that it could not possibly have been written in Rome. The subscription at the end of the letter forms no part of the letter, but is merely the opinion of some transcriber, perhaps derived from some tradition. In the Alexandrian MS. the subscription says that it was written in Laodicea. This we shall see is very possible. But in the letter there is not the slightest allusion to anything in Rome connected with the persecution under Nero.

In i., 17, we read of Onesiphorus: "When he was in Rome he sought me out diligently, and found me." This is taken to signify that Paul was then in Rome, but this cannot be. The passage agrees very well with the circumstances of the two years' imprisonment, but certainly not with the supposed second imprisonment under Nero. When he was sent to Rome as a prisoner there was absolutely no charge laid against him. He was sent simply because he appealed to the Emperor against the vio-

lence of the Jews (Acts xxv., 27, xxvi., 32). The Centurion, who had the charge of him, regarded him as innocent, and treated him with the greatest kindness and courtesy, allowing him at Sidon to go and visit his friends; and everything on the voyage tended to increase this kindly feeling. Consequently the letter of Festus, the report of the Centurion, and the fact that he was a Roman, caused his treatment to be of the mildest description. It was necessary that he should be detained till his cause was tried, but he was not in a prison, but in his own hired house, with perfect liberty to preach, and to receive any persons that came to him; but for security it was necessary that he should be chained to a soldier. Now what is said about Onesiphorus exactly corresponds with this (2 Tim. i., 16 and 17): "He oft refreshed me, and was not ashamed of my chain; but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently and found me." Now these words imply, first, that the imprisonment continued for a considerable time; secondly, that Paul had a choice of residence, and that Onesiphorus had some difficulty in finding out where he did reside. But, in that terrible persecution, Paul, if in Rome, would have been put to death at once, or if his execution had been put off, it would have been only till the next exhibition of burning; and he would have been, not in his own hired house, but in a prison; and Onesiphorus would have had no difficulty in finding him if he had dared to make the attempt.

At Rome they show the Mamertine prison as the place where Paul was confined. But it would have

been impossible "oft to refresh" or visit a prisoner who was let down into that frightful abode as it then existed, nor would there be any need of "a chain" to keep the prisoner safe. But supposing Paul had been in that prison, if Onesiphorus had manifested any sympathy with him during the persecution, he would not have escaped torture and death as a Christian. Other facts also, hereafter stated, show the impossibility of the tradition.

It is certain that Paul was a prisoner when he wrote this letter (2 Tim. ii., 9), but he would not have had the chance of writing a letter from Rome during Nero's persecution. Where was he, then? I think 2 Tim. i., 15, throws light upon the question: "All they which are in Asia be turned away from me." This could not possibly have been written in Rome. If Paul had been in Rome writing about persons in Asia, he could not have said, "They have turned away from me"; he might have said, "they have turned away from Christ, or from the Gospel." But if he had meant persons who were in Rome, he could not have said, "they which are in Asia." The words therefore point most distinctly to the fact that Paul was in Asia. But he was not in Ephesus (iv., 12). Asia properly signified a small district around Ephesus, but that also gave its name to the Roman Province of Asia. In this latter sense it is used here as in Acts xix., 26 and 27, and Rev. i., 4.

From the above it is evident that St. Paul returned to Ephesus after his Macedonian journey, as he expressed his intention of so doing in his first Epistle to Timothy. But he would not confine his

labours to Ephesus, but would visit the other towns of the neighbourhood. In one of these towns he was a prisoner "as an evil doer" (2 Tim. ii., 9) for preaching the Gospel. He had very recently been at Miletum, for there he left Trophimus sick (2 Tim. iv., 20). From the same verse we learn that his Macedonian journey had been lengthened to Achaia and that, for some part of it at least, Erastus had been his fellow-traveller. But when they came to Corinth, Erastus remained there. He was the treasurer of the city (see Rom. xvi., 23, written from Corinth). Through love of the world Demas had forsaken the Apostle. Creseus had gone to Galatia, and Titus to Dalmatia, probably sent by Paul on missionary work. But Tychicus he had sent to Ephesus, which seems to signify that Timothy was no longer there, for, if there, he would not have required this information. Thus St. Paul accounts for the fact that, of all his fellow-workers, Luke, the beloved physician, alone remained with him.

Paul was a prisoner, but not in close confinement, for, as we have seen, he was allowed to direct the movements of other Christian workers, and to receive the visits of other Christians (2 Tim. iv., 21).

This could not have been in Rome during the fierce persecution. He even requested Timothy to come and bring Mark with him, as he would be useful to him for the ministry; but to ask them to come to Rome would have been equivalent to asking them to certain death, for the only safety for Christians in Rome was flight or concealment.

Again, Paul had been once before the magistrate, on which occasion "no man stood with him, but all forsook him." This he regarded as very wrong (2 Tim. iv., 16), for there was no danger. Had it been in Rome, it would have been their duty to escape, if possible. And though his enemies, like wild beasts, were thirsting for his blood, he was "delivered out of the mouth of the lion" (verse 17). He was allowed, according to Roman law (Acts xxv., 16), to answer for himself. And what was the nature of his defence? Simply a full setting forth of the Gospel, "that the preaching might be fully known, and that ALL THE GENTILES might hear." How could it ever enter into the imagination of any man that Paul could have been allowed to stand up and preach the Gospel publicly in Rome during that fiery persecution, and that he should be reserved for another opportunity?

But 2 Tim. iv., 6-8: "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand; I have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith; henceforth, there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness," etc., is always taken to mean that he fully expected to be put to death, and is quoted to prove that he died in Rome. But such an interpretation is by no means necessary. Of course, till sentence was pronounced, he very properly recognised the possibility that it might be one of condemnation, as, in exactly similar circumstances towards the end of his two years' imprisonment, he used exactly similar language (compare the words with Phil. ii., 17, and i., 20-26), though he then really expected to be

released. But, apart from this, the language was very suitable to St. Paul's condition. In his Epistle to Philemon, he spoke of himself as "Paul the aged." Since that time some years had passed, and, as in former times, they were years of incessant labour, of continual persecution, of bodily suffering and weakness, and anxiety about the state of the various Churches (2 Cor. xi., 23-28). His continued labours and sufferings were sufficient to break down even a strong constitution. But Paul appears to have been of a weak and delicate constitution (Gal. iv., 13; 2 Cor. x., 10), and this may have been the reason why Luke, the beloved physician, alone remained with him. And from his age also Paul must have realised that "the time of his departure was at hand," that he had in reality finished his work. Yet, if necessary, he was as willing to lay down his life for the Gospel as he was when he wrote his Epistle to the Philippians, or as when on his way to Jerusalem he said (Acts xxi., 13), "I am ready not to be bound only, but to die also at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus."

But did he not at this time expect to be condemned? Certainly not. The fact that he was allowed such freedom of action would lead to the conclusion that the magistrate did not regard him "as an evildoer." And allowing him to direct others in spreading the Gospel inclines to the opinion that he had no objection to the Gospel. And reserving Paul for another hearing was probably nothing else than a desire to know something more about the Christian religion. And St. Paul not

236 *WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?*

only said that at his first answer "he had been delivered out of the mouth of the lion," but expressed his confidence that the Lord would "deliver him from evil work," that is, from all the evil designs of his enemies. And it was in consequence of this expectation that he requested Timothy to bring Mark, who would be useful to him for the ministry. But if Paul was condemned, of what use could Mark be to him? He would probably have been executed before Mark arrived. Further, why should Paul ask Timothy to be diligent and come before winter, and bring the cloak that he had left with Carpus at Troas, if he had not thought that he would need it during the coming winter? Timothy was at Troas, or some place beyond, whither he had been sent from Ephesus by Paul after his return from the Macedonian journey. The cloak was not a sacrificial vestment as some, in their anxiety to find an argument for the priesthood, have tried to persuade the world, but a thick, rough cloak, often made of leather, from which it derived its name, worn for a protection against rain and storms, sometimes even by women. This, again, entirely disposes of the fiction that Peter and Paul suffered martyrdom in Rome. Paul's working and traveling days were almost ended when he wrote this second Epistle to Timothy, but we know not the end, but we have seen satisfactory evidence that it was not in Rome. In concluding this account of the latter days of St. Paul, I would add that, as St. Paul would not willingly have gone back to Rome during that persecution, so no magistrate could have sent him to Rome against his will, for,

according to Roman law, a prisoner must be tried and, if found guilty, punished in the province where his crime had been committed.

XIII.—FURTHER EVIDENCE FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

I WILL now return to St. Peter. I need not repeat the evidence of the Epistle of Clemens, nor of the Acts of the Apostles, nor that already quoted from the Epistle to the Romans; but will add that in that Epistle Paul said (xv., 24), that he would pay them a passing visit on his way to Spain. His object was (chapter i., 11) to "impart unto them some spiritual gift." Now this is a proof that neither Peter nor any other Apostle had been to Rome. For what spiritual gift could he bestow that Peter could not? The gift of the Spirit for conversion, for edification, for instruction, for direction, for comfort, is given to everyone who asketh (Luke xi., 13), without the intervention of man. But St. Paul (2 Cor. xii., 12) speaks of the signs of an Apostle having been wrought among them. What, then, were the signs of an Apostle? Working miracles? Not exactly. There were many in Corinth, Galatia and other Churches who did this. Philip wrought great miracles in Samaria, but he could not convey that power unto others. But when Peter and John came, they laid their hands on some, who thereby received the power. This was the sign of an Apostle. It was a power which could not be transferred, otherwise it would have ceased to be the sign of an Apostle. Now, as no Apostles had been

238 *WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?*

in Rome, no such gift had been received there. The enemies of the Church therefore might ridicule them for talking of miracles in other places, whereas in Rome, the chief city, there was nothing of the kind. They might say, also, that the Apostles were afraid or ashamed of coming there. Therefore St. Paul added that he was *not ashamed* of the Gospel, but was ready to preach in Rome also (i., 15 and 16), an expression which could hardly be reconciled with the idea that Peter was already or had been preaching in Rome.

Again (Rom. xv., 20), Paul said that it had been his great aim not to preach the Gospel where Christ was already named lest he should build on another's foundation. Why, then, did he write this long letter, if Peter founded and was Bishop of the Church of Rome? Was not this building on another man's foundation? Was it not intruding into Peter's diocese? His desire to impart some spiritual gift, which they had not, nor could have, except some Apostle visited them, was no deviation from the rule which he had laid down for himself, for Peter had never been in Rome.

Further, the letter was on a very delicate subject, to reconcile the Jewish Christians to the admission of Gentiles, to which they were bitterly opposed. This required great delicacy and tact, so as not to give offence. And St. Paul apologised (vv., 15) for being so bold as to write unto them. But he did not tell them that he had Peter's permission to do so, and without that surely the apology was rather due to Peter. But Paul was conscious

that his advocacy of the equal privileges of the Gentiles would be highly offensive to the Jews, and would most probably stir up in them a bitter enmity against himself, which we may judge from Col. iv., 10 and 11, written a few years afterwards, was actually the case (see page 242). He therefore three times solemnly assured them that, as a Jew, he greatly loved them, and was willing to submit to any sacrifice for their salvation (Rom. ix., 1-5, x., 1 and 2, xi., 1). Under these circumstances, if Peter had been the founder and Bishop of Rome, is it credible that he could have refrained from in some way referring to Peter and his teaching to obviate the prejudice against himself? The only reason that can be given for his not doing so is the fact that Peter and his teaching were not known in Rome. And what makes it the more remarkable is, that Paul sent salutations to a considerable number of persons in Rome, thirty of whom he mentions by name (xvi., 3-13), some as working for the spread of the Gospel. Now, if Peter had been Bishop of Rome, would it have been possible that he could have named so many persons without any allusion to Peter?

The above are facts which afford unanswerable arguments against the Episcopate of Peter. But Father Vaughan easily disposed of the fact that Peter was not mentioned by saying that Bellarmine, Alexander, Natalis and others informed us that Peter was not in Rome when the letter was written. This I most steadfastly believe. But he meant that Peter was only gone away for a little season, but how and where was this important piece

of history found? It appears to me that it was (like Platina's information of Peter's "Will") discovered in the brains of a man who lived about 1,500 years too late, and discovered for the purpose of getting rid of awkward facts. It was more easy to send Peter on some expedition than to get rid of the facts out of the letter. But if Peter were temporarily absent, that could have been no reason why he and his work should be overlooked, but the contrary. Paul did not forget to remind the Colossians (Col. i., 7) of how much they owed to Epaphras, though he was many hundreds of miles away from Colosse. How, then, could he treat Peter with such disrespect? Surely, he ought to have reminded the Christians of Rome of how much they owed to Peter. He did not do so, because Peter had not been there. Romanists are often driven to adopt strange arguments, and the force of them lies entirely in the audacity with which they are put forward. We may further observe that St. Paul strongly insisted upon obedience to civil magistrates (Rom. xiii., 1-7), but not one word does he say about obeying Peter. Such omission is unaccountable, when we consider their many differences and difficulties in which the *authority* or advice of Peter was far more important than that of all civil magistrates put together, for the Pope, as successor of Peter, claims absolute power over all kings, princes, and magistrates, but he could inherit from Peter no more than Peter himself possessed. Papal claims are founded on falsehood.

XIV.—EVIDENCE FROM OTHER EPISTLES.

A FEW years after writing the Epistle to the Romans, St. Paul was a prisoner in Rome. Towards the end of that imprisonment he wrote four letters. In these also there is not a word about Peter. This, again, is remarkable, if Peter were in Rome. But for the absence of the name of Peter in these letters Father Vaughan gave the following reason (in this case I believe the discovery was his own), Peter had escaped from prison (Acts xii.), therefore "Peter carried his life in his hands. He was crucified soon enough, without St. Paul publishing broadcast to the world where he was and what he was doing." When reminded that Paul was writing to Christian Churches, and not to heathen magistrates, he replied: "It was well for St. Peter and the Church that St. Paul knew that men were men, and women women; and he was not going to give up Peter for the sake of padding his letter with local news." Poor Peter! What an anxious and uncomfortable life he must have had! Still, it is strange that he should have taken up his abode in the very city where his escape took place and have attended the Council of the Apostles and Elders. Did anybody know that he was there? And when he was publicly preaching for so many years in Rome, did nobody know that he was there? Certainly not, for what was known in Rome was quickly known in all the provinces, so that Paul would have had no reason to fear mentioning it. But this, like transubstantiation, was a matter in

which man's senses and common sense were not to be trusted! . It would have been well if Father Vaughan, instead of inventing absurd reasons for the Apostle, had been content with Paul's own reason for mentioning Peter as stated by himself. He had no more reason for mentioning Peter than he had for mentioning James or John, or any other Apostle. But he tells us that the only Jewish fellow-labourers, who had been a comfort unto him, were "Aristarchus, Marcus, and Jesus, who is called Justus" (Col. iv., 10 and 11). All the Gentile Christians would be in full sympathy with Paul. The declaration that only these three Jewish fellow-labourers had been a comfort unto him is a plain declaration that Peter was not there, for Peter was a Jew.

XV.—1 PETER v., 13.

THERE is just one more point to be noticed. Romanists constantly quote 1 Peter v., 13, "The Church that is in Babylon saluteth you," as proof that Peter was in Rome, for they say Babylon here means Rome. But what proof is there that it there means Rome? "Because, in the Book of Revelation, Rome is called Babylon." They are so far right, that whenever the word Babylon occurs in that Book it undoubtedly means Rome—but the harlot, apostate Rome. The Book of the Revelation is strictly a symbolical Book, and everything in it is symbolically expressed. Therefore, if Rome was to be mentioned at all, it was necessary that it should be under a symbolical name. But why should

Peter in a plain letter use a symbolical word to express where he was? If he were in Rome, it would have been easier and far more natural to write Rome than Babylon. The latter term without any explanation could only deceive, in fact, it would have been a deliberate lie. If a letter should be produced in any court of justice directed from a certain place, it would be taken as unmistakable evidence that the writer was in that place when he wrote, unless clear evidence could be produced to the contrary. But what evidence is there that Peter was not in Babylon? None whatever, except that, if we believe that he was there, the last pretence of Peter's Roman Episcopate vanishes. I think it would be impossible to imagine any reason why Peter should write Babylon if he meant Rome, except we should adopt Father Vaughan's wise suggestion that "Peter carried his life in his hands," and therefore, like an escaped convict, thought his only safety was in concealment.

Peter's mission was to the Jews (Gal. ii., 8), and as there were many Jews in the neighbourhood of Babylon, chiefly descendants of those who remained there after the Babylonian captivity (comparatively few returned), is it at all improbable that he would visit them? This letter gives countenance that he did, not only by the use of the word Babylon, but by being addressed to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bythenia. He was evidently viewing them from the East, that is, from Babylon. If he had been in Rome, that is, viewing them from the West, the order would naturally have been re-

versed. Consequently, when he wrote Babylon he meant Babylon and nothing else. But whilst the Church of Rome claims the authority of both Peter and Paul, she believes neither the one nor the other.

The Epistle to the Romans is the first notice that we have of that Church, and when it was written there was a great number of Christians in Rome, and many Christian workers, some who had been Christians a longer time than Paul himself. This state of things carries us back to a very early period, certainly many years before the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 52. For it would be absurd to suppose that for nearly twenty years after the day of Pentecost there were no Christians in Rome, but that within eight years after that Council, A.D. 60, there were so many workers, and within twelve years, A.D. 64, the number of Christians in Rome was so great that, in the persecution which then began, an immense multitude were slain. But Peter never left the neighbourhood of Palestine before A.D. 52 (and probably for some years after that). Hence arises another question for Romanists, as it is the maxim of their Church, "*Nulla ecclesia sine episcopo*," "There can be no Church without a Bishop." Who was the Bishop of that early Church? Independently of former arguments, this alone proves that Peter was neither the founder nor the Bishop of the Church of Rome.

XVI.—THE CONCLUSION.

FROM the foregoing evidence it is manifest that St. Paul never was in Rome after his two years' imprisonment, and that St. Peter never saw Rome. All the traditions on which the Church of Rome rests (and there is no other evidence) place Peter's arrival in Rome at an early date. We have seen that these utterly break down. And it is evident from the Acts of the Apostles that Peter never left the neighbourhood of Palestine before the Council of Jerusalem. After that, we have no account of him at all, except that in his old age he was in Babylon. Next we have St. Paul's letter to the Church of Rome, from which it is evident that St. Peter was not at that time, nor ever had been, in Rome. And we have seen how Bellarmine conjured up an argument to set aside that overwhelming evidence. Not very long after that Paul was sent as a prisoner to Rome, where he remained two years, towards the end of which he distinctly shows that Peter was not in Rome during that time. Then a few weeks after Paul left Rome the great persecution began, and it is not likely that Peter went there during the persecution. Finally, the Epistle of Clemens clearly shows that Peter was unknown in Rome, and that nothing was there known of the death of either Peter or Paul. In fact, you cannot

thrust in Peter at any point without contradicting some plain evidence.

Now the Church of Rome boasts of Apostolical succession—that the Popes and Bishops have received their consecration in a direct unbroken line from the hands of the Apostles, but it is evident from what has been stated that the chain is too short, it lacks the first link, and it has been shown that it lacks many other links, or rather, that the chain has been but a rope of sand (pages 21-23). There is absolutely no connection with the Apostle, and therefore no Apostolical succession at all. Therefore no Priesthood.

PART V.

THE REAL FOUNDERS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME.

By whom was the Church founded in Rome? This is nowhere stated. It was not necessary that it should be stated any more than it was necessary that we should be told who founded the Church of Laodicea, Hierapolis, Sardis and others. St. Paul said (1 Cor. iii., 5-7) that it was of no consequence who founded a Church, we ought to look to God and not to man. But this opinion of the Apostle did not long prevail. The various Churches soon began to regard it as adding to their importance to trace their origin to some Apostle, or to someone sent directly by an Apostle. This led them to invent, or to accept, any tradition by which they might claim such a founder. But we have seen that for the traditions about Peter and Paul, there is not the shadow of evidence that will bear examination.

But is there nothing to lead us to some definite opinion on this subject? Yes, there are some facts from which we may gather sufficient evidence almost, if not altogether, to amount to certainty.

St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, said, that he had had for many years a great desire to visit the Church of Rome. But this implies that the Church had, some years before the Epistle to the

248 *WHO FOUNDED THE CHURCH OF ROME?*

Romans was written, attained considerable importance to call forth that early desire. This growth would require a length of time, which would place its origin at a very early date.

Next we know that there were Jews and Proselytes from Rome in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, when 3,000 persons were converted. It would be hard to believe that there were not some of those strangers from Rome among the 3,000. These on their return would carry their new religion with them, and would soon form a congregation, or Church. The following facts confirm this reasonable conclusion.

These first converts would not differ from the rest of the converted Jews. Therefore they would preach to "none but Jews only" (Acts xi., 19). So the Church would consist of none but Jews, and those strongly opposed to the admission of Gentiles. For ten or eleven years after the day of Pentecost no real attempt was anywhere made for the conversion of Gentiles till Paul and Barnabas were ordained for the work about A.D. 47. After that, the progress of the Gospel among the Gentiles was great; and no doubt many found their way to Rome. But they would not be well received by the Church. They would be repelled with the declaration: "Except ye be circumcised after the manner of Moses, ye cannot be saved" (Acts xv., 1). And though the number of Gentile converts greatly increased, the Jewish element was for a long time in the ascendant, so much so that the heathen population of Rome regarded Christians simply as a sect of Jews.

So the Church of Rome was divided into two

opposing parties, the greater part being intolerant Jews, and it was to reconcile these opposite parties that the Epistle to the Romans was written, in other words, it was to induce the Jewish Christians to lay aside their exclusiveness, which was a great hindrance to the spread of the Gospel, and also to their own spiritual good.

Here we have evidence :

I.—That the Church of Rome must have been founded at a very early date.

II.—That it is scarcely possible to doubt that there were Christians in Rome immediately after the day of Pentecost.

III.—That the Christians would be bitterly opposed to the reception of Gentiles.

IV.—That the state of the Church, when the Epistle to the Romans was written, was beyond doubt exactly what would result from such a beginning.

This is as strong evidence as, under the circumstances, could possibly with any show of reason be expected; and, what is of very considerable importance, there is not a single fact that can be quoted to weaken that evidence.

ANALYSIS OF THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS CONFIRMING THE FORE-GOING REASONING; ALSO A KEY FOR THE RIGHT UNDERSTANDING OF THE EPISTLE.

AN examination of the Epistle to the Romans will clearly show that Christians in Rome were divided

into two opposing parties. The Jewish Christians, who could not tolerate the thought that Gentiles could be on an equality with themselves, and the Gentile Christians, who, in consequence of that opposition, would, in most cases, have no very kindly feeling towards the Jews. Such a state of things could scarcely have existed (at least the separation would not have been so great) if Peter had been the founder of the Church of Rome. As a faithful Apostle he would from the first have taught that there was no distinction between Jews and Gentiles in the Church of Christ. This no doubt would have repelled many, if not most, Jews from listening to the claims of the Gospel. But those who received the Gospel through him would have received it on the understanding of this equality. And if Peter continued to labour in Rome, as tradition says that he did, his continued influence would have tended to confirm this mutual toleration and forbearance. But the Epistle to the Romans reveals a state of things the very opposite to this.

The one great object of the Epistle was to convince Jewish Christians that they ought to acknowledge Gentiles as, equally with themselves, members of the Church of God. St. Paul knew from past experience (and he had to experience it still more afterwards; Acts xxi., 20-23; xxii., 21 and 22) that this would be most unpalatable to the Jews, and would most likely prejudice them against himself and his letter. Therefore, as far as possible, whilst stating the truth without wavering, he had so to write as to conciliate their minds, in order to win a hearing for his arguments.

The keynote of the Epistle is sounded in chapter i., 16: "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Gentile." St. Paul then showed how the Gentile world had fallen into gross idolatry and wickedness. The Jews would most gladly assent to this. But St. Paul immediately turns (chapter ii.) and shows that the Jews are equally condemned, and that their boast of being Jews and circumcised could not save them (verses 28 and 29). At once the Jews would exclaim (chapter iii.): "What advantage, then, hath the Jew? And what profit is there in circumcision?" The Apostle answers this at length, concluding with the question: "Is God the God of the Jews only? Is He not of the Gentiles also? Yes, of the Gentiles also." Next, the Apostle suggests another Jewish objection: "What shall we say then that our father Abraham hath found?" (chap. iv., 1). Throughout the chapter he showed that Abraham was justified by faith before he was circumcised, when he was, in fact, just in the same state as the Gentiles. The conclusion from this is, that the Gentile also may be justified in faith. "Therefore (chapter v., 1) being justified by faith we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ." Then he pointed out, that just as all, both Jews and Gentiles, were equally involved in the fall, so the remedy was equally provided for all, that "where sin abounded grace did much more abound."

From this the question seems naturally to arise (chapter vi., 1): "Shall we then continue in sin that grace may abound?" The Apostle rejected

the idea with horror; and went on to show the necessity of a holy life. Then (chapter vii.), still addressing Jews, who knew the law that "a woman which hath a husband is bound by the law to her husband as long as he liveth" (the Gentiles had no such law), he showed that they who depended on circumcision were bound, as married to the law, which could never save them. The law can only condemn sin, without providing a means of escape. And the more a man knows of the holiness of God's law, the more he will see his helpless state. But when he is brought to despair of deliverance by his own efforts, then (verse 25), thank God, there is perfect deliverance in Jesus Christ our Lord.

Chapter viii. begins: "There is therefore (therefore shows that the argument with the Jews is still continued) no condemnation to them, who are in Christ Jesus;" and he points out the absolute necessity of having the Spirit of Christ, and being led by the Spirit. In verse 16 he says, that the Spirit testifies to such, that they are all the children of God. Then, looking forward into the future and the call of the Gentiles, he as the Apostle to the Gentiles anticipates a glorious prospect for the Church, which will more than compensate for all the sufferings and persecutions in the attainment of it. "For the earnest expectation of the 'creature' waiteth for the manifestation of the sons of God." I believe the whole of this important and beautiful passage is generally misunderstood through a wrong interpretation of the word *κτίσις*. It here signifies the whole Gentile world, as in Mark xvi., 15, compare Matt. xxviii., 19, and in Colos-

sians i., 23. Animals are not expecting to become sons of God. The animal world is not groaning, waiting for the adoption. The animal world is now, and will continue to be, what it was intended, when created. But man is not what he was intended to be. He has gone away from God, and is therefore far removed from lasting peace and happiness, which can never be found till he returns to God. Therefore St. Paul says, "not only is the Gentile world groaning and travailing in pain together until now, but we ourselves, who have the first fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves also groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption (deliverance) of our body." Observe "body," not "bodies." The body of Christ, of which every converted man is a member (Rom. xii., 5; 1 Cor. xii., 12-27; Eph. i., 23, iv., 4-25). St. Paul had the first fruits of the Spirit, but this did not satisfy him, but rather intensified his desire for the conversion of the Gentiles. For this he laboured, and prayed with an unutterable longing (verse 26). Then, like St. James (Acts xv., 18 and 19), he signified that the call of the Gentiles was according to God's purpose, and that God would carry out His purpose. So identifying himself with them, he asks: "If God be for us, who can be against us?"

Now, if the common interpretation of the latter half of chapter viii. were correct, the Jews would have had no more cause to be offended at it than the Gentiles. But Paul knew that the hearts of the Jews would rebel against what he wrote, and therefore (chapter ix., 1) he immediately apologised

to them, assuring them that he loved them, and was willing to suffer anything for their salvation. Then he pointed out that the word of God had not failed. If Jews claimed to be sons of God, because they were the seed of Abraham, the Ishmaelite might do so; if through Isaac, the Edomites had the same claim. But as the call of the Israelites had been solely according to the will of God, so the call of the Gentiles is now according to the will of God. And if the Jews lost their privileges, it was because they resisted the purpose of God towards them. This Paul confirms by referring to the potter and the clay (see Jer. xviii., 6). So God now bestows His mercy on "us, whom He hath called, not of the Jews only, but also on the Gentiles." And this he confirms by a number of quotations from the Old Testament. But St. Paul knew that the Jews could not tolerate even their own Scriptures quoted in favour of Gentiles (Luke iv., 25-29), therefore he again apologised to them (chapter x., 1), but added that their failure arose from seeking to establish their own righteousness, instead of submitting to God's righteousness. Afterwards, he again declared that in God's plan of salvation there is no difference between the Jew and the Gentile. Then, again, he concluded by quoting several passages of the Old Testament, in which it was foretold that the Gentiles would accept God's way of salvation, whilst the Jews refused it.

Then comes the final question (chapter xi., 1): "Hath God then cast away His people?" Paul answered this: "God forbid, for I also am an Israelite." And if he could be saved, why not

others? He tells them that there was then a remnant, according to the election of grace, who were willing to be saved in God's own way. Afterwards, in a few verses, he warned the Gentiles not to boast against the Jews, as some might do, through mistaking what he had written. And thus ended the argumentative part of the Epistle, but not all the evidence of the divided state of the Church of Rome. In the former part of the letter Paul had insisted upon the necessity of a holy life, without mentioning any particular duty. But chapter xii. contains a considerable number of duties, all stated in the briefest manner possible. But chapter xiii. dwells on a duty which, in the case of the Jews, required more than a passing notice. Through their expectation of a temporal Messiah, who was to exalt their nation above all other nations, they became proud and overbearing towards Gentiles, excited and always on the point of rebellion. This became a national sentiment, so that even when a Jew became a Christian he still remained a Jew. The Apostle therefore dwelt upon the duty of submission to the King (Emperor) and to magistrates appointed by him. Then he dwelt upon the duty of love, love to their neighbours, which in the state of the Church of Rome was needful. Finally, in chapters xiv. and xv., the Apostle exhorts Jews and Gentiles to exercise mutual forbearance, not to despise or condemn each other for differences, which were not essential, and this duty he enforced by appropriate quotations from the Old Testament (xv., 9-12). After which he attempted to soothe any irritation of mind that his

letter may have caused, and apologised for his boldness in writing to them.

Looking at the facts as they are stated, the first thing that is evident is that the Epistle was written to Jews, who professed to have received the Gospel. Next, that the Jews formed the most important part of the Church of Rome, confirming the belief that the Gospel was preached in Rome for some years before any Gentiles were admitted into the Church, and therefore by Jews, who would insist upon the necessity of circumcision. In fact, the Epistle fully confirms the belief that the Church was founded by some of the converts of the day of Pentecost.

PART VI.

ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST
PROTESTANTS.

CHAPTER I.

AGAINST THE PROTESTANT BIBLE.

ROMANISTS frequently reproach Protestants for what they call an imperfect (or something worse) Protestant translation of the Bible. I believe that no Protestant ever professed that our translation was perfect; but it would have been time enough for the charge when their own Church had produced a perfect translation. I recollect a Dr. Cahill, a Romish priest, saying, that he would rather a Catholic should read the most immoral book than the Protestant Bible, using at the same time very strong language about it, as many others have done. It would be more satisfactory if, instead of abusive language and vague charges, they would point out the corruptions and wilful perversions, but this they neglect. Many years ago I read the controversy between Dr. Cumming and Mr. French, a barrister, in which the latter brought the serious charge against the Protestant translators of the Bible, that they had wilfully corrupted the text (1

258 ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

Cor. xi., 27) by substituting "and drink this cup" for "or drink this cup." The same charge is often repeated, and no wonder when Romanists find the following note on that verse in their Bible, "Or drink. Here erroneous translators corrupt the text by putting, and drink (contrary to the original ἢ πίνειν) instead of or drink." To prove that they have got a real case against the Protestant Bible and the wickedness of the translators, they actually quote the original Greek! I wish the Church of Rome would always quote the original Greek, and stand by it. But on the strength of this "or" the Church of Rome claims the right to withhold the cup from the laity, whereas St. Paul, in verse 25, says, emphatically, that the drinking of the cup is as much the duty and privilege of the laity as the eating of the bread. And this is confirmed by St. Matthew, who records the fact, "and they all drank of it," and the same is confirmed by St. Luke. By withholding the cup, the Church of Rome takes away the most significant part of the Sacrament (see page 132).

The real force of this assertion will be further manifest by examining the meaning of our Lord's word (Matt. xxvi., 28): "This is my blood of the *New Covenant*." Luke xxii., 20, and 1 Cor xi., 25: "This cup is the *New Covenant* in my blood." By the expression "*New Covenant*" He definitely alluded to the Old Covenant. In like manner we read (Heb. xii., 24): "Ye are come . . . to Jesus the Mediator of the *New Covenant*, and to the blood of sprinkling." To this, also, allusion is made (Heb. x., 22): "Let us draw near, having *our*

hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water." So 1 Peter i., 2: "Elect . . . through sanctification of the Spirit unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ." The words of Jesus in instituting "the Lord's supper" evidently referred to Exod. xxiv., 3-8, where we are told that when Moses came down from the mount he told the people all the words of the Lord, and they answered "with one voice, all the words which the Lord hath said will we do." Then an altar was built and sacrifices were offered. And Moses took half the blood and sprinkled it on the altar, and half of it he sprinkled on the people and said, "Behold the blood of the Covenant, which the Lord hath made with you." By this Covenant God and the people were mutually bound. God in condescension bound Himself to be their God, and they were bound to love, honour and obey Him. Now, all that that blood signified to the Israelites, "the blood of the New Covenant," is to those who believe and obey Jesus, and much more, because the New Covenant is founded on greater and more precious promises (Heb. viii., 6). But all this the Church of Rome ignores or takes away by refusing the cup, which is the sign and seal of the New Covenant, to the laity. Great therefore is the sin of the Church of Rome in this matter. But if the wine in the cup did actually become the blood of Christ, since the law of God absolutely forbade the drinking of that blood (see page 138), what ought to be done with it? As the Church of Rome interprets the words "This is my blood" literally, so, to be consistent, they ought to

260 ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

interpret the foregoing quotations literally, and then, as in the Old Covenant to which our Lord referred, they ought to sprinkle part of the blood on the altar and part on the people.

But how stands the matter with regard to the reading? The Alexandrian MS., one of the three most ancient MSS., and some others give "and" in this verse. And also the Vulgate text of Pope Sextus V., who professed that he had corrected the edition with his own hand, reads "et," "and." Did he also wilfully corrupt this verse? From this it is evident that, however the mistake arose, it did not originate with Protestants, nor did it ever influence the doctrine or practice of Protestants, who relied solely on Christ's command. But "or" is undoubtedly the correct reading, and is so given in the Revised Version. Now, in the four verses where it occurs, "eat *and* drink" is repeated four times. Why did St. Paul write "or" in the fifth case? For the same reason that "or," and not "and," is found in the second part of Mark vii., 10. The command is, "Honour thy father *and* thy mother." Then observe the change, "Whoso curseth his father *or* his mother let him be put to death." "Or," in 1 Cor. xi., 27, gives the Church of Rome no more authority to withhold the cup from the laity than "OR" in Mark vii., 10, gives authority for a man to curse his father or his mother. But the Church of Rome, whilst pretending to obey Christ, presumptuously sets aside the most significant part of His command.

Now let us consider what the Church of Rome has done towards supplying us with the pure word

of God. In the first place, it rejected the words of the Apostles and Prophets; and the reason alleged by the Council of Trent is rather amusing. They said: "If we allow of reference to the Greek and Hebrew text, we shall be kept in perpetual hot water. The grammarians will throw everything into confusion. They will be the arbiters and judges of our faith." And, again: "How will the Inquisitors be able to proceed against the Lutherans, unless they know Greek and Hebrew?" And the objection to Greek does not seem to have passed away in some places. The late Dr. Passalenti told me that when he was studying for the priesthood a fellow-student had a Greek Testament, but, as soon as the College authorities knew it, it was taken from him and never restored. And Passalenti himself, though a Doctor of Divinity, had never seen a New Testament till a friend gave him one, which led to his leaving the Church of Rome. So the Latin Vulgate was declared by the Council of Trent to be the only authentic text of the Bible (in spite of errors).

Let us now consider the Vulgate. The text in use at the time of the Council of Trent was so full of errors that revision was found to be necessary. This was undertaken by Pope Sextus V., and published by him A.D. 1590. In the preface he tells us that he has corrected the proofs with his own hand. In a Bull which he published at the same time, he described his text as absolutely correct, and threatened with the wrath of God, and of the blessed Peter and Paul, all who should presume to make any alteration. Notwithstanding this terrible

262 ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

threat, Clement VIII., who succeeded in 1592, found this work of infallibility so full of errors, that a fresh revision was necessary, which was in due time accomplished, and published with a similar infallible assurance of perfection, and a similar denunciation against anyone who should dare to alter it. But when these infallible editions were compared they were found to be very diverse, some passages in the one omitted in the other; and altogether they differed from each other in more than 2,000 places.

But what has the Church of Rome done towards giving us a perfect translation in English? Absolutely nothing before the Rheims translation, A.D. 1582. Yet the advocates of that Church will sometimes say, that it has always encouraged the reading of the Scriptures. If it had been the wish of the Church of Rome that the people should read the Bible, surely it had sufficient time to give it them before A.D. 1582. But to translate the Scriptures into the language in which the people can understand, was not allowed by the laws of the Church. But the circulation of the Scriptures by Protestants rendered it necessary that something should be done by the Church of Rome.

The Rheims translation was made from the Latin Vulgate eight years before it was corrected by Sextus V. Yet the translators laboured in their efforts to prove that the Latin was more worthy of credit than the Greek. They also try to defend the Church in withholding the Scriptures from the people, and their own work of translating them; as they put it "neither absolutely forbidding nor

authoritatively commanding them." The fact is, the Church did not allow the Scriptures to be read at all, except with her own interpretation; nor were they to be read even with these comments, except by "Such as haue expresse licence thereunto of their lawful ordinaries, with good testimonie from their curates and confessors."

Then they speak with approbation of former times, when the Scriptures "were in Monasteries, Colleges, Churches; in Bishops' and Priests' and some other devout principal laymen's houses and hands." To which they add: "The poore ploughmen could then in labouring the ground sing the hymns and psalms either in knowen or unknown language, as they heard them in the Holy Church, though they could neither reade nor know the sense, meaning and mysteries of the same." How very profitable! The Scriptures read in the Church, if read at all, were in Latin. No English translation existed except that by Wicklif, which the Church condemned. It is evident from this defence of the Church, that it had no desire that the people should have any intelligent knowledge of the Scriptures.

But what can be said about the Rheims translation of the New Testament? It was full of errors. But in the latest edition of the Douay Version, of which the Rheims New Testament forms part, many of these errors have been corrected by the adoption of the authorised Protestant translation. But not only was the Rheims translation full of errors, but it included the forged letter of Clemens to St. James. A more manifest and ignorant forgery can hardly be imagined. In it St. Peter is repre-

sented as saying before his death in the presence of the people (if Peter died in Rome he was only surrounded by heathens): "I appoint Clemens as your Bishop. I give to him the power of binding and loosing, which was given to me by the Lord." Then Clemens goes on to instruct St. James about the sacraments, the mass, etc., as if St. James wanted instruction in Christian doctrine! The writer was ignorant of the fact that St. James died before St. Peter, according to Eusebius. Yet this acknowledged forgery was included in the Rheims New Testament, to impose on the ignorant, because it taught the doctrines of the Church of Rome.

The translators also say: "We have also set forth reasonable large annotations, whereby to shew the studious reader. . . . (how to avoid heresy) which means whosoever trusteth not, for the sense of Holy Scripture, and had rather follow his private judgment . . . he shall worthily through his own wilfulness be deceived"—and so suffer—"eternal damnation." This is not simply adding to God's word, it is substituting man's words for God's word. For if the Bible seems plainly to say one thing, and the Church says the opposite, the Church must be obeyed rather than God. Few persons who are accustomed to read the New Testament could ever dream that it was possible to learn from it, that "heretics" ought to be exterminated. Yet such is the teaching of these annotations. For in Matt. xiii., 20, and 2 Tim. iii., 9, they signify that heretics are only tolerated because they are too strong to be extirpated. The sentiments of the Church of Rome are still the same (see pages 53-

67). And, again, in Rev. xvii., 6. "When Rome puts heretics to death, and allows their punishment in other countries, their blood is not called the blood of saints (pages 5 and 6 and 144) no more than the blood of thieues, mankillers, and other malefactors, for the shedding of which by order of justice no commonwealth shall answer."

The Douay Bible, containing the Rheims translation of the New Testament and all the original annotations with the forged Epistle to St. James, was again published in Dublin in 1816 by the Roman Catholic publisher Coyne, with the approval of Dr. Troy, the Primate, and other R.C. Bishops. The atrocious nature of the comments, however, caused such indignation, that Dr. Troy tried to escape from his approval of them; but Coyne, in a letter to the R.C. paper, the *Freeman's Journal*, showed that the parts of the work, as they were printed, were submitted to him for his approval. Since then the atrocious teaching has been left out, but continues in the College of Maynooth (see pages 67 and 68); but this does not come under the observation of the people generally, and therefore little is thought of it.

The Douay Bible, however, still contains many grievous departures from the original text which affect the doctrines of the Church (see pages 112, 158, and 159.) When these are removed it will be time enough for Romanists to find fault with the Protestant Bible.

As I said before, if Protestants had not translated the Bible, the Church of Rome would have done nothing. For many hundred years she has

266 ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

shown the greatest hostility to the Bible, and not without cause, for it condemns her doctrines and practices.

Popes and Councils alike have condemned the reading of the Bible. Clement VIII. decreed that anyone found reading the Bible in the vulgar tongue should be sent to the galleys for life. Pope after Pope has denounced the work of Bible Societies. Pope Pius IX. was most bitter against them. Under him Francesco Madiari and his wife were sent to the galleys for reading the Bible, and an Englishman, Arthur Walker, was sent to prison for having a Bible in his pocket.

I may here state that the Church of Rome has never, to the present day, given to the Irish a translation of the Scriptures in their own language. Is not this keeping them in ignorance? The Protestant Hibernian Bible Society has published one, but this is a forbidden book, and it would be a mortal sin for a Romanist to read it. Query—May not the zealous attachment of the Irish to the Church of Rome and hatred of Protestants be accounted for by their ignorance of the Bible?

Some time ago I received a report of the "Italian Evangelical Publication Society," which rejoiced in what appears to be a complete revolution in the policy of the Church of Rome. The Society of St. Jerome has printed at the Vatican press a translation of the Gospels and Acts of the Apostles with notes, and published it at the small price of from twopence to fourpence, according to the binding. Protestants are rejoicing at the prospect. They are not afraid of this Romish translation even with

Romish notes; for, though many, through priestly influence, may pay more attention to the notes than to the text, many will see how far the notes differ from the text.

What has led to this change? We cannot judge of motives. But the change is so great that we may well suspect, that the reason has not been made known. It may be that it has been forced upon the Church by the thought that the only way of checking the spread of Protestantism through the reading of the Bible is to publish as widely as possible their own translation with notes, as was the case with the Rheims translation. But will it last? Protestants hope it may, although they infinitely prefer allowing the Scriptures to speak for themselves without note or comment. A few years ago Lasserre translated the Gospels into good modern French. The work was approved of by the Archbishop of Paris and other Bishops, and the Pope sent a letter of thanks to Lasserre, giving him his Apostolical blessing. The work quickly passed through several editions, when it was suppressed, so that it was impossible to obtain a copy. A friend of mine, however, has a copy with the Pope's letter. Now, if the work was bad, why did the Pope commend it? If good, why suppress it? The only reason which suggests itself is, that the people were learning too much. Will it be so in the present case?

What was the attitude of the late Pope in this matter? He promised an Indulgence of 300 days to everyone who spends a quarter of an hour daily in the study of God's word. But in his letter to the

Cardinal Vicar of Rome, March 25th, 1879, he asserted that, if he had the liberty he claims, he would employ it to close all Protestant schools and places of worship in Rome (*Times*, April 11th, 1879). If he were of the same opinion still (and as an infallible Pope he ought to be), and if some of those whom he had induced by his offer of Indulgence to read the Gospels should thereby have been convinced that the doctrines of the Church of Rome cannot possibly be reconciled with the Gospels, and should therefore have been compelled to leave that Church, the Pope, if he had had the power, would not have allowed them to worship God according to their conscience, which inclines one to think that, if he had had the power of former Popes, he would not have allowed them to live, though they became "heretics" through his own act. There is, however, one thing that gives a hope that the change is real, and that it may continue. The Preface alludes, with apparent approval, to the work of the Bible Society, "long carried on with much activity by our Dissident Brethren." Did the Church of Rome ever before call Protestants "Brethren"? I don't remember a case. How different from the violent language of Pius IX. against Bible Societies! The Preface also, speaking of the good to be derived from the study of the Gospel, says: "If our religious life be somewhat wanting in moral force, this comes of our failure to acquaint ourselves with the Gospel." So Protestants have always taught.

Italian Protestants are rejoicing in the thought that their countrymen will now be able to learn

something of the Gospels published by the Church of Rome. Doubtless, their opinion coincides with that of Cardinal Wiseman, though their sentiments are opposite. The Cardinal wrote in his "Essay on the Use of the Bible": "The prohibition of the reading of the Scriptures is the stronghold of the Church's unity. Let the faithful but read the Scriptures, and the government of the Church will tumble to pieces, insubordination will enter, and self-sufficiency and pride take the place of humility and docility." No doubt the exercise of the power of private judgment which God hath given us, with a humble and prayerful study of God's word, for which we are responsible, is in the estimation of the Church of Rome a mark of insubordination and pride (we call it a mark of obedience to God), for that Church cannot stand against the testimony of the Scriptures.

That the Scriptures were intended to be read and studied by everybody is manifest from the language in every part. Deut. xxix., 29: "Secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but those things which are revealed belong unto us and our children for ever." So the Epistle to the Corinthians was addressed "to the Church (*τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ*, the congregation) which is at Corinth, with all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours," and if addressed to them, it was to be studied by them (see Col. iv., 16). If any part of the New Testament were to be kept from the people on account of difficulties, without doubt it would have been the Book of Revelation, but that Book begins with "Blessed is he who readeth, and

they that hear the words of this prophecy," *the words, not the Church's explanation of them.* And it ends with pronouncing a curse on those who add to or take away from the words of the Book. The Church of Rome has been guilty on both these points, or more correctly, it has taken away from the people the word of God, and given them human tradition instead. When I consider the testimony of history, with the character of that Church, as described, not by enemies, but by her own children, and especially what the Bible says about it (2 Thess. ii., 3-12; 1 Tim. iv., 1-2; Rev. xiii., xvii.), I cannot help fearing that her present action is not sincere. For more than a thousand years, whenever she has had the power, she has shown the bitterest hostility to the Bible being read in a language that the people could understand. Has she now changed? "*Timeo Danacs et dona ferentes,*" I fear the Church of Rome even when making concessions. The Scriptures hold out no hope of that Church being reformed (2 Thess. ii., 8). Her boast of being "*semper eadem,*" always the same, is too true. In fact her boast of infallibility renders reformation impossible. Reformation would mean that the Church had been in the wrong, and was therefore not infallible. Therefore there is the exhortation (Rev. xviii., 4): "*Come out of her my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.*" The Church has not expressed the slightest regret for her past murders and cruelties. She has not revoked or modified any of her unscriptural doctrines or laws. She has not renounced the blasphemous teaching of any of

her canonised saints. All these things are simply glossed over to be kept as much as possible out of sight. Still, the present movement (a confession that in this important matter the Church, Popes and Councils **HAVE BEEN IN ERROR**) may be of God, and by it God will carry out His purpose. As long as it continues, and as yet there is no sign of going back, the eyes of multitudes of Italians will by the Holy Spirit be enlightened to the acceptance of the truth and the saving of the soul.

CHAPTER II.

THE ORIGIN OF PROTESTANTISM.

ROMANISTS, besides saying that the Protestant Bible is corrupt, also constantly affirm that Protestants owe their religion to Henry VIII., and no words are too strong to stigmatise him as a blood-thirsty and licentious tyrant, who in order to gratify his lust changed his religion, and cast off his allegiance to the Pope, and suppressed the monasteries to obtain their possessions. How Romanists can for very shame rail against Henry VIII., when compared with contemporary Popes, is, indeed, a marvel. That monster of iniquity, Alexander VI., was living during the early part of Henry's life.

It is well, however, to look at facts. Henry never did change his religion. He certainly did cast off the authority of the Pope, and we will give the reason. But to the end of his days he held fast all Romish doctrines. Four years after he had renounced the authority of the Pope, and the Pope had excommunicated him, he published his famous "six articles," which condemned to death all who denied the doctrines of the Church of Rome. And Lingard, the R.C. historian, states that during his last illness he was constantly attended by his confessor, and daily heard mass and received the communion in one kind, a sufficient proof that he had not changed his religion. And therefore his

wrong-doings, so far as religion had anything to do with them, were the result of Romish doctrines. But he cast off the authority of the Pope—and who was responsible for this? On the death of his brother Arthur, Henry became heir to the throne. Arthur had married Catherine of Aragon, and in order to retain the large dowry which she had brought, it was proposed that Henry should marry his brother's widow. Henry objected to this, but the Pope granted a dispensation for the marriage, though it was contrary to the law of the Church. After marriage Henry and Catherine lived comfortably together for nineteen years. Many children were born unto them, but all died in infancy except Mary. Negotiations were entered into for her marriage with the son of the King of France, but they were broken off on the ground that Mary was a bastard, that the marriage of Henry and Catherine was illegal. This was enough to make any parent uneasy. Henry afterwards professed to see a confirmation of this in the death of his children as a judgment, according to Lev. xx., 21, where it is said that a man who married his brother's wife should die childless.

As yet Henry had given no cause to suspect his sincerity. But he separated from Catherine in 1527, till the question of the legality of the marriage was settled. He appealed to the Pope Clement VII., who would have annulled the marriage which his predecessors had allowed, but he was afraid of the Queen's powerful nephew, the Emperor Charles V. So the Pope would give no direct answer, but granted a commission to Cardinals Wolsey and

T

274 *ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.*

Campeggio to enquire into the case. After considerable delay Campeggio, when the King expected an answer, prorogued the court till some future day. All the English R.C. Bishops (except two who believed in the Popes' power of dispensation) and the two Universities declared the marriage invalid. Henry appealed to all the Universities on the Continent, and got the same answer. Still, he could get no definite answer from the Pope. All kinds of tricks, excuses, and equivocations were resorted to, to avoid giving an answer. According to Lingard, the R.C. historian, the Pope granted to Henry "a dispensation to marry, in the place of Catherine, any other woman whomsoever, even if she were already promised to another, or related to him in the first degree of affinity." And he proposed to Casselis, the King's Ambassador at Rome, "to grant his Majesty permission even to have two wives at the same time." But this was no answer to the question of the validity of his marriage with Catherine. After waiting for six years in the vain attempt to get the question authoritatively settled, the King cast off the authority of the Pope, and declared that the Pope had no power in England. If this was wrong, who was to blame? It is said that the King separated from Catherine because he had fallen in love with Ann Boleyn, and that he rejected the authority of the Pope because he would not sanction his marrying her! If Henry had been anything like the person he is represented, is it at all likely that he would have waited for six years before gratifying his desire? The Pope's shockingly disgraceful and

immoral propositions, and Henry's refusal to act upon them, entirely clear Henry's character in this matter, and the guilt recoils on the Pope. The only honest interpretation of Henry's conduct is, that he clung to the marriage with Catherine as long as there was the slightest hope of getting from the Pope a definite answer to confirm it.

The latter part of Henry's life casts a shadow over the whole, which Romanists have turned to their own account. But Protestants need not, so far as the question affects Protestantism, undertake to defend Henry, for he never was a Protestant. The only point in which he differed from other Romanists was, that he declared that the Pope ought not to have any power or authority in England, and acted upon it. Other Kings of England had made the same declaration. But for this action of Henry, Romanists ought to blame the Pope and not Henry. And may not this long delay and bitter disappointment have had something to do with the change in the life of Henry? This last sentence was written on the supposition that the latter part of Henry's life was as black as his enemies have painted it, but an honest examination into the circumstances would remove much of that blackness. This, however, is not necessary here, for, as before proved, Henry was not a Protestant in any sense, and therefore Protestants could not possibly have got their religion from him.

CHAPTER III.

DISSOLUTION OF MONASTERIES.

TOUCHING the motives which led to the dissolution of the Monasteries, I cannot do better than give what a learned friend, the late John Bellows, wrote on the subject.

“ More important, however, than the question whether the Monasteries ever did, in their earlier history, come up to the expectation of the earnest men who founded them, is that of their actual state at the period of their dissolution in England. School-books for the most part tell us that, although there were ‘irregularities’ among them, their dissolution was an irreparable loss to the country, being due to the caprice and greed of Henry VIII.; some of the ‘Extension’ lecturers incline to the same view. The truth is, that the school-books and the lecturers are so taken up with the misdeeds of Henry VIII. that they have no time to touch upon certain facts with which Henry had nothing to do. But these facts are of the greatest interest and value for forming a right judgment on one of the most important events of our national history. Much exception, for example, is taken to the bias of the commission appointed by Henry’s Government to enquire into the state of the Monasteries. But this was not the only commission appointed, nor was England the only country in which the enquiry was

made. Pope Paul III. cannot be accused of bias against the Monasteries; yet complaints against them reached him in such force, and from such a variety of sources, that he appointed a commission to enquire into their condition generally. Its members were exclusively Cardinals; among them were Reginald Pole, who can hardly be suspected of playing into the hands of Henry VIII., and Cardinal Caraffa, afterwards Pope Paul IV. No writer or lecturer who deals even briefly with the dissolution of Monasteries has any right to omit mentioning this commission, and the substance of its official report to the Papal See, delivered in 1538, at the very period of the dissolution in this country, which was from 1538 to 1539. It says:—

“ ‘ Another abuse needing correction is the religious orders, because they have so deteriorated that they are a serious scandal to the laity, and do the greatest harm by their examples’ ‘ We are of opinion that they should all be abolished, etc.’

“ If it was the opinion of the Cardinals of the Roman Church that the Monasteries did ‘ the greatest harm by their example,’ and that ‘ they should be abolished,’ then it is evident that all the endeavours to set up a standard of purity higher than that of the family circle had failed utterly. More than a thousand years of evolution in one experiment after another had ended in this verdict of the very guardians of the institution that it had so ‘ deteriorated,’ that the only thing to be done with it was ‘ to abolish ’ it.

“ This had nothing to do with Henry VIII., or his misdeeds. If he had never been born it would

278 ROME'S CHARGES AGAINST PROTESTANTS.

evidently have been the duty of the English Parliament to abolish the Monasteries, if they were in the condition which the Pope and his counsellors seriously averred that they were in all over Europe. There were no fewer than thirty heads of Monasteries in the Parliament that passed the Act of Dissolution, and when the commissioners' report of the abuses in the various houses were read, Lingard states that not one of the twenty-eight Abbots and two Priors opened his lips in refutation of it. Yet even if the charges made had been untrue, it is not much like Englishmen to sit still under them, no matter what the risk of speaking might be. There was great indignation against the betrayal of the trust of which the bulk of the monks had been guilty; but amidst all the indignation there was an endeavour to do justly in dealing with the vested interests involved, notwithstanding the unworthiness of so many of the participants in them.

"The Cardinals in their report already alluded to, in order to guard existing interests, recommended that the older monks should be allowed to continue for the rest of their lives, while all the younger postulants should be sent to their homes. The English Government acted in the spirit of this, and gave to every monk and nun, who was under twenty-four years of age at the dissolution, the option of remaining under the vow of celibacy and receiving a pension for life; or being released from it, and receiving one year's pension and a suit of clothes.

"Those who imagine that the object of the Government, or of the King, in dissolving the Monasteries, was to obtain their revenues, have pro-

bably never endeavoured to reconcile this theory with the fact that no monk or nun of over the age of twenty-four was allowed to go free with the one year's salary, although many entreated permission to do so; for in every case, without exception, such persons were obliged to keep under the celibate vow for the rest of their lives, although it involved the payment of the annual pension. The amount of the pension varied with the rank of the recipient; that is, more for Abbots and other dignitaries, but for the monks themselves the usual income of a parish curate, and for the nuns one-half as much.

“ If spoliation was the aim it was clumsily managed. That favouritism affected the allotment of the estates thrown into the market by the nation is probable. It affects many things now; but if the allottees paid twenty years' purchase for the lands, and fifteen years' for the buildings, the terms, on the whole, do not appear very different from those which would be secured at the present day, if a twentieth part of all the land in the country were suddenly offered for sale. As the total revenues confiscated amounted to under £170,000 a year, and out of the proceeds of the sales the debts of every monastery were cleared off, and the pensions provided for the thousands of monks and nuns for life, as well as the income of half a dozen Bishoprics, and the cost of fortifying places on the South Coast, with that of building ships for the Navy, it is not easy to suppose any very large balance left for the King, or anyone else.

“ The dissolution of the Monasteries was the snapping of the chain of endeavour to make a sys-

tem perfect, which, on the testimony of Paul III., was inherently incapable of being perfected. We are sometimes told that the nation suffered great loss by the change. It is not easy to see where the loss comes in. It could not have been in respect of learning, or of the general diffusion of knowledge, as is shown by the rise of the Elizabethan era of the national literature after the Monasteries were closed. It certainly was not in respect of the moral example set by the monks; for on this point the language of Cardinal Pole and of More leaves nothing to be said."

The writer had given in full a long letter by Sir Thomas More on the subject.

(The above is the concluding part of a paper read by the late John Bellows in Tintern Abbey. Taken from the "Proceedings of the Cotteswold Naturalists' Field Club," Vol. III., Part I, June, 1899.)

In the "Contemporary Review" for April, 1906, there is an article entitled "The Truth about the Monasteries," in which Mr. G. G. Coulton, from facts carefully gathered from original contemporary records, has drawn a very black picture of the moral condition of the Monasteries during the period from 1248 to 1334, from which it is evident that their condemnation by the Pope's commissioners before mentioned, and their dissolution, had been richly deserved for more than 300 years.

In conclusion it may be said, that under the best circumstances the existence of convents cannot be reconciled with our Lord's words: "Let your light so shine before men that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in

Heaven " (Matt. v., 16), for of the inmates in convents nothing either good or bad can be seen by the world, but the fear of inspection rather suggests that all is not good.

ADDENDA.

NOTE ON PAGE 37.

A new illustration of the true nature of the Church of Rome has recently been given to the world. The documents of Mgr. Montagnini, the Pope's agent in Paris, which were seized by the French Government, prove beyond question the unscrupulous character of the Pope and the papal government. Those documents reveal a plot, hatched in Rome, against the French Government. In all that voluminous correspondence between Mgr. Montagnini and the Court of Rome—of which the Rome correspondent of the "Tablet" says that Pius X. recently told a company of Spanish pilgrims that the city of Rome, according to the will of Jesus, was to be the dwelling of His Vicar on earth, and the centre from which the light of the Gospel was to be diffused throughout the world—religion finds no place. Religion is reserved for a cloak to cover the POLITICAL AIMS of the Church. But that cloak was not wanted on documents, which were never to be published. Therefore the name of God is not even mentioned. Divine help, guidance and approval are not recognised by either side in the correspondence. They relied solely on worldly means, and those the most dishonest and dishonourable, to accomplish their object.

Further, when Mgr. Montagnini was taken and conducted beyond the frontier of France, the papal court became alarmed lest that secret correspondence should fall into the hands of the French Government. The

Pope therefore immediately summoned a secret council of Cardinals on whom he could rely. They concluded that no time was to be lost, and that Catholic Spain was most to be relied upon in this important business. They therefore induced Señor Ojeda, the Spanish Ambassador in Rome, to telegraph (in cipher of course) as in the name of the Spanish Government to Señor Leon y Castillo, the Spanish Ambassador in Paris, requiring him, without delay, to take possession of the office and to demand from the French Government the possession of all the papers of Mgr. Montagnini. Señor Ojeda, as a true son of the Church, obeyed without communicating with his Government. Had Señor Leon y Castillo acted upon that order, there would doubtless have been a collision between the Spanish and French Governments. It was an unheard of piece of diplomacy. Señor Leon y Castello saw the danger, and, being in daily communication with Madrid, he could not understand why the order, if genuine, should not have been sent direct to himself. He therefore applied to Madrid for instruction. His telegram caused no little surprise and indignation to the Spanish Government, who replied that no such order had been given, and renounced the whole affair.

Señor Ojeda excused himself by asserting that Mgr. della Chiese and Cardinal del Val, who had been commissioned to deal with him in this matter, informed him that the Courts of Rome and Madrid were in perfect agreement in the matter, and added, that if he refused to act as they directed he would incur the displeasure of his Government, and cause great injury to the Church and to Spain. Señor Ojeda also says, that he never for a moment suspected that what Mgr. della Chiese and Cardinal del Val said was not strictly true.

No doubt excuses, denials, insinuations, etc., will be abundantly employed by those who are interested in

maintaining papal integrity and infallibility, but they who desire to know the truth, and will examine the facts, will find that it is a case of astoundingly dishonest diplomacy, clearly showing the true character of the Church of Rome. The anxiety about the important correspondence, and the means taken to prevent it falling into the hands of the French Government, are sufficient evidence. The circumstances all testify to the true character of the Church, that it is dangerous to society, that it is the greatest mischief maker of modern times, as it has been in the past. And the question is suggested, can such a Church in any sense be trusted? Yet the greater part of Englishmen seem to think that those, who have been traitors to France, will be faithful to England, and therefore they are content that they should come and settle among us!

If anyone desires to know more about the Jesuits, who are now the ruling power in the Church of Rome, I would, in the strongest language that I could possibly use, recommend to him a little pamphlet of thirty-four pages by H. A. Henderson, "Shall we tolerate the Jesuits?" price twopence, published by Chas. J. Thynne. The amount of well-authenticated facts is sufficient to create what might well be called a revolution in the minds of the people. The great danger to our country is the apathy and indifference of the great majority of the people arising from their ignorance of the facts. But if they could be induced to read that little book, they would resolve that things must not go on as at present, that other political questions, though important, must be postponed till this was settled. Indeed, I am convinced that there are thousands of Roman Catholics who would be greatly shaken in their attachment to their Church if they knew the facts. But the Church of Rome forbids her members, as a mortal sin, to read any Protestant literature, hence her power over them.

NOTE ON PAGES 92-93.

Fasting was a custom amongst the Jews, and there were a number of other customary outward demonstrations of grief, but none of these were of divine appointment, though they are frequently mentioned in the Bible, and sometimes even put in the form of a command. But such apparent commands simply express what would be the effect of God's severe chastisements, as in Jer. iv., 8, "Gird you with sackcloths, lament and howl." But such things, though apparently commanded, were not required. Jesus condemned all outward demonstrations of fasting and mourning.

Fasting is not condemned, because such would often be a condemnation of the innocent, since there are many cases in which the feeling of grief is so strong that the person cannot eat. Jesus himself fasted forty days. But He did not go into the wilderness for the purpose of fasting, but to prepare for the great work He had come to accomplish, and His mind was so intensely fixed upon that, that He thought not of food nor felt the need. At the end of that time His bodily strength was exhausted, which gave great force to the temptation to turn stones into bread. But dependence on the will and providence of God is of infinitely more consequence than food even in the most extreme case (Matt. iv., 4). So after the temptations "Angels came and ministered unto Him" (verse xi.).

As fasting is not forbidden neither is it commanded. All that Jesus said about it was, that if you do fast, let it be an honest fast. Do not make a display of it; do not pretend to feelings which you have not got; let it be a matter between God and yourself (Matt. vi., 16-18).

The Apostles, according to custom, sometimes fasted with prayer, but in this case we are not bound to follow their example. St. Paul (1 Cor. xi., 1) said, "Be ye

followers of me, even as I also am a follower of Christ." But in this matter we do not find that Christ either taught or practised fasting. Everyone ought to act according to his own judgment and feeling in this matter. To my mind the benefit of adding fasting to prayer is very doubtful. In most cases the feeling of hunger would have a tendency of drawing away the mind from the object for which we are praying. If it be said that fasting tends to mortify our evil and corrupt affections and desires, the effect is only temporary and may be followed by indulgence and excess. This is not a mere supposition. I have known such cases. But not only does excess often follow fasting, but license and excess are often the preparation for seasons of fasting. In Romish countries these preliminaries to fasting are called "Carnivals," i.e., "Farewell to the flesh and carnal indulgence," in which the restraints of religion are cast aside. The season of fasting is strictly insisted upon by the Church of Rome, but I do not remember a case in which the Church endeavoured to put a stop to the carnival.

But such importance has been attached to fasting that God's word has suffered thereby. St. Mark ix., 29, wrote: "This kind can come forth by nothing but by prayer." Here was an opportunity, so "and fasting" was dishonestly added. Then, having secured something more than a mere sanction for fasting, the whole verse with the addition was dishonestly inserted into the Gospel of St. Matthew xvii., 21. A similar case is found in 1 Cor. vii., 5. St. Paul wrote, "That ye may give yourselves to prayer." To this was added "and fasting." These corrupt passages are often quoted to enforce fasting as a duty, and no doubt would be quoted against all the evidence I have given to the contrary.

The interpolations were made very early when fasting

had gained importance in the Church. And it is easy to understand how one zealous for the practice could in such circumstances make the addition, and all MSS. copied from that one would contain the words. But it is not easy to see how, under the circumstances, the words, if in the original, could have been omitted in the best and most ancient MSS., as in the Vatican. They certainly have the appearance of interpolations, and agree not with our Lord's general teaching and practice. And most modern students of the MSS. omit them without hesitation, some admit them as doubtful. Therefore to quote them to establish any doctrine or practice can only show the weakness of the cause.

NOTE ON PAGE 160.

That the Gospel of St. Matthew was written for Jews is still more manifest from the genealogy itself. The Israelites had no single word to express either "ancestor" or "descendant," except father and son. Every ancestor was called the father. St. Matthew begins by saying that Jesus Christ was the son of David, the son of Abraham. Hence (Heb. vii., 8-10) the Levites are said to have been in the loins of Abraham when Melchizedek met him. Abraham therefore might be said to have begotten all the Levites. Therefore in the genealogies any number of generations might be omitted, so long as the direct line was kept. Many examples of this are found in the Old Testament. Jehu is generally called the son of Nimshi, the intermediate Jehoshaphat (and perhaps some others) being omitted. Jezebel is called the daughter of Omri, the name of Ahab being omitted. So also in the case of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.). In Ruth iv., 18-22, we find only eight generations from Pharez to David, that is, for more than 920 years, being 430 years in Egypt

(Exod. xii., 40), and 40 years in the wilderness, and 450 years (Judges) to the time of Samuel (Acts xiii., 20). *According to custom a number of generations were omitted.* These omissions, through not being observed, have caused great difficulty to those who base their chronology on genealogies which were never intended to teach chronology, but would be no difficulty to the Jews. So St. Matthew, in order to divide his genealogy into three equal parts (probably to assist the memory), omits some names. Thus in verse 8 three names are omitted between Joram and Ozias, namely, Ahaziah, Joash and Amaziah. This clearly shows that St. Matthew wrote for Jews. They would observe the omission, but would see no difficulty in accepting it, being accustomed to such omissions.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS.

	Page		Page
Absolution, Priestly	85-88, 118	Church, Romish idea of the	206
Adrian, Pope, established		" Catholic	191
Idolatry	62	" v. Bible	192-194
Alexander VI.	69	Cicero on pagan Rome's	
Altars	136	tolerance	3, 4
Annates	75	Clemen's Epistle	225
Apocrypha	149	" spurious Epistle	263
Apostolical succession	21-23, 33, 69-71, 246	" Episcopate, A.D. 91	215
" " prejudged	219	Clement XIV. suppressed	
Arianism	184	the Jesuits	37
Arnobius	60	Cletus, A.D. 78	215
Assumption of the Virgin	48, 49	Commandment i.	55-58
Augustine on Luke xxii.,		" ii.	59 63
19, 20	125	" iii. R.C. ii.	58
Augustine on John vi.,	131	" iv. " iii.	63
Babylon	2, 242	" v. " iv.	64
Baptism	101-107	" vi. " v.	64-68
Baronius on Papal display	18	" vii. " vi.	71
" on the state of		" viii. " vii.	72, 73
the Church	70	" ix. " viii.	74
Bartholomew's Eve	5, 6	" x. " ix., x.	74, 75
Bellarmino on Rev. xvii,	7, 8	Confession to a Priest	86-88, 118
" <i>Δάρευνος</i>	14-16	Confessional	88-92
" Priesthood	21	Confirmation	80
" 4th Commandment	64	Cross, a bit of the "Mis-	
" Corruption of the		terio"	40, 41
Church	74	Cyprian, 3rd cent., on Pre-	
Bernard, St.	204	cedence	32, 33
Bible in Irish	266	Cyprian against tradition,	
Bishops	110, 111	requires Scripture	51
" The first of Rome	244	Cyril rejects tradition, re-	
Body of Christ once offered	28, 114, etc.	quires Scripture	52
Bonaventura, Perversion		Demon, <i>Δαιμόν</i>	42-44
of Psalms	176	Diocletian's persecution	5
Brothers of our Lord	169-173	" change of gov-	
Burning candles, etc.	63	ernment	10
Calf, The Golden	60, 61	Douay Bible	263-265
Casa Santa	38, 39	Dulia and Hyperdulia	53, 54
Catholic v. Protestant	190	Duns Scotus	204
Celibacy of clergy	45, 46	' <i>Εκκλησια</i> , signification	190
<i>Χρηματίξω</i>	220	' <i>Εκ τῶν ἁγιά</i>	10
		Elohim	69
		' <i>Εφάπαξ</i>	114

	Page		Page
Epiphanius on Peter and Paul	213	Lateran Council, A.D. 1215. Heretics to be extirpated	25
Eucharist, Romish explanation	119	Lateran Council, A.D. 1514, declared heresy extinct	26
Eusebius' Chronicle	217	Liberius, Pope, in Arian	184
Extreme Unction	83	Liguori on the Assumption	49
Fasting	47, 92-94	Liguori on 4th commandment	64
Gates of Hell	184	Liguori on 8th commandment	72
Genealogies, the two explained	-161, 162	Liguori on the glories of Mary	57, 176-180
Genealogies, Romish explanation	162, 163	Linus, Bishop of Rome, A.D. 66	215
Gibbon on Diocletian's new empire	10	Loretto, The holy house of	38, 39
Gregory the Great on supremacy	33	Luther's thesis, A.D. 1517	26
Gregory II. and III. advocated Idolatry	62	Man of sin, Origin of the	30, 31
Hades	184	Marianus de Luca	65-67
Heads, The seven	-2, 9-11	Mary, Extravagant worship of	53, 54, 176-180
" The eighth pagan	10	Mary not always a virgin 166-169	
Henry VIII.	-212 214	" not free from sin	171-173
ἱερεὺς Hierens, signification	109	" Bible and Romish account of 158-173	
Horns, The ten	8	Marriage	82
Idioms	10, 86, 87, 198	Mass, The	-119-141
Idolatry established A.D. 786	62	" foretold	29
Image worship	59-63	" Payment for Masses	151
Immaculate Conception	204, 205	Maynooth	67, 68, 72, 73, 265
" " a myth	166	Melchizedek	115
Indulgences	76, 152-154	Μεράνοια	95-100
Infallibility 71, 184, 203-209, 261, 262		Μεραμύσεις	97
Inquisition	6, 7	Minacius Felix	136
Interpretation Romish rule	50	Monasteries, Dissolution of 276-280	
Invocation of Saints	55	Monks	69, 280
Irenæus' tradition	-213, 214	Mortmain	76
Jesuits, Rise of	36	Mother of harlots, Rome	3, 4
" character	37	" of all Churches, Antioch 220-222	
Joakim and St. Ann	165	Mystery	18-23
Καθηγήρι	17	Nero's persecution	4, 5, 223
Keys, The	185	Niebuhr on Diocletian's persecution	5
Kings, The seven	9	Niebuhr on Diocletian's government	10
" The eighth	10	Nuremberg, Diet of	75
Lactantius on images	60	O'Donnell on Irish education	65
" on μεράνοια	96	Onesiphorus	230
Lasserre's translation	267		
Lateran Council, A.D. 1215, decreed the doctrine of transubstantion	140		

INDEX.

291

	Page		Page
Papa Re, II	14-17	Purgatory	142-157
Pastor's lives of the Popes	69	Rome, Church of, Mythical Founders	210-246
Paul's latter years . .	227-236	Rome, Church of, True Founders	247-256
Penance, Origin of the word	84	Rosary v. Matt., vi., 7 . .	108
Penance, Sacrament of . .	84-94	Rule of interpretation, Romish	50
Persecuting spirit of Rome	5-7, 65-68	Sacraments	80
Peter's traditional death .	223-225	Saint Worship, Origin of . .	43-45
Peter's and Paul's death unknown in Rome	225, 226	Saints, Intercession of . .	55-58
Pilgrimages	63	Scarlet mark of the beast .	12
Pope, The, Christ's vicar .	17, 20	Sins, mortal and venial . .	76, 148
" A caricature	11, 12	666	12-16
" Only a layman	23	Sodom and Egypt	27 28
" The black Pope	35-37	Supererogation	78
Power, Struggle for	32-34	Tacitus on Nero's persecution	4, 223
Prayers to saints	55-58	Tertullian insists on Scripture	51
" for the dead	149	Tertullian on Malachi i., 2 .	136
Presbyteros and Hiereus .	109	" " Tradition	213
Pride a mark of the Apostasy	18-20, 32	Tradition condemned . . .	51-54
Priest, Origin and history of word .	109-112	Transubstantiation	119-127
" No Priest in Christ's Church .	112-118	Trinity	53
Priesthood extinguished .	21-23	Vulgate	212
" Sin of assuming the	113	" revised by Sextus V. . . .	261
Protestant v. Catholic . .	190	" " Clement VIII. . . .	262
		Wiseman Card	28, 269
		Witnesses, The two	25-27

TEXTS EXPLAINED.

	Page		Page
Gen. iii., 15	158	Matt. xxvi., 26-28	123
Exod. xxxii., 1-5	60	" xxvii., 3	97
Lev. xvi., 17	117	" xxviii., 18-20	206
" xvii., 10, 11	138	Mark iii., 21	171
Isaiah lxii., 2	220, 221	Luke i., 28	159
" lxx., 1, 2, 15	220, 221	" iii., 23	162
Mal. i., 11	137	" xxii., 19, 20	119-124
Matt. i., 25	166	" xxiii., 43	143
" x., 20	98	" xxiv., 33	86
" xii., 32	145	John i., 12, 13	106
" xvi., 18, 19	181-187	" ii., 4	172
" xxiii., 9	16	" iii., 5	102-103

	Page		Page
John vi., 53 54	128-130	I Tim. iii., 15	194-203
" xx., 23	85-88	" iv., 1-5	42-48
" xxi., 15-17	187-189	2 Tim. i., 18	150
Acts ii., 1-4	86, 87	" ii., 25	97
" xi., 26	220, 221	Heb. v., 6	115
" xvii., 30	97	" vii., 2 and 23	115
" xx., 21	98	" vii., 24	118
" xxv., 19	44	" vii., 27	114
Rom. i., 11	237	" ix., 12	114
I Cor. iii., 13	142	" ix., 22	141
" v., 5	146	" x., 22	105
" v., 4, 5	88, 146	" xii., 17	97
" x., 21	136	" xiii., 11, 12	138
" xi., 27-29	131-135	James v., 14, 15	83
" xi., 27	258-260	I Pet. iii., 19, 20	143
" xv., 6	114	" iii., 21	103, 104
" xv., 29	146	" v., 13	242-244
2 Cor. ii., 7, 8	88, 146	Rev. xi.	25-29
" vii., 10	99	" xii.	24
2 Thess. ii., 1-12	32-41	" xiii., 11-15	36, 37
" ii., 15	52	" xvii.	2-24

TEXTS QUOTED OR REFERRED TO.

	Page		Page
Gen. v., 22	167	Ezra ii., 61	161
" vi., 5	143	Prov. xxiii., 7	97
" xxiii., 4	184	Isaiah vi., 10	87
" xli., 13	87	" xxxviii., 10	184
Exod. xix., 6	113	" liii., 4, 6	77
" xx., 5	179	" lv., 1, 2	129
" xxiii., 3-8	259	" lxii., 4, 5	2
" xxix., 14	138	Jeremiah i., 6	204
Lev. ii., 2, 9	120	" i., 10	87
" v., 12	120	" iii., 14, 20	2
" xii., 4-6	168	" v., 14	25
" xx., 21	273	" ix., 26	101
Num. iii., 10	113	" xv., 16	129
" xv., 30, 31	145	" xvii., 5	179
" xxxvi., 8, 9	161	" xviii., 66	254
Deut. xii., 23	125	" xxxi., 32	2
" xxv., 5	163	" xxxi., 34	77
" xxx., 6	101	" xliv., 17-19	180
I Kings xix., 18	63	Ezek. xxxvi., 25, 26	103
2 Kings xviii., 4	63	Hosea ii., 19	2

	Page		Page
Matt. i., 18	160, 164	John i., 42	182
" ii., 12	220	" ii., 4	172
" iii., 8-11	98	" iii., 14, 15	103
" iii., 2	95, 101	" iii., 36	88
" iii., 11	101, 106	" iv., 23, 24	59
" vi., 7	108	" iv., 34	130
" viii., 14	46	" vi., 15	170
" ix., 14	92	" vi., 53	107
" x., 18	15	" x., 25, 37, 38	127
" x., 37	173	" xi., 47-50	170
" xi., 20	98	" xii., 44, 45	99
" xiii., 24, 30	191	" xiii., 16	189
" xiii., 25	193	" xiv., 6	198
" xiii., 55, 56	169	" xiv., 26	174, 193
" xv., 22, 23	182	" xv., 24	127
" xvi., 17	201	" xvi., 13	174
" xvii., 1	198	" xvi., 19-22	93
" xix., 5	163	" xvii., 17	106, 179
" xxiv., 5, 6	4	" xix., 26, 27	203
" xxvi., 28	258	Acts i., 6	193
" xxvi., 52	201	" i., 8	202
Mark iii., 30	146	" i., 14, 15	86
" iii., 21, 31	171	" i., 16-18	87
" iii., 33, 35	173	" ii., 38	99
" vii., 15	47	" v., 17	86
" viii., 27-33	186	" v., 31	97
" x., 6-9	82	" viii., 21	107
" xii., 36	201	" x., 22	221
Luke i., 1-4	193	" xi., 1, 2	219
" i., 25	204	" xi., 18	97
" i., 34	164	" xi., 20	218
" ii., 22	168	" xiii., 38, 39	77, 91
" ii., 26	221	" xiv., 23	80
" ii., 35	174	" xv., 10	189
" iii., 30	165	" xix., 40	190
" vii., 19	145	" xx., 21	88
" ix., 18-22	186	" xx., 17-28	110
" ix., 33	182	" xx., 20, 27	175, 194
" ix., 52-56	19	" xx., 28	189, 191
" xi., 27	173	" xxi., 9	46
" xi., 52	185	" xxv., 16	6
" xii., 32	208	" xxv., 19	44
" xiii., 3-5	98	" xxvii., 23	201
" xvi., 6	198	Rom. i., 1	54
" xvi., 10	73	" i., 3	160
" xvi., 13	54	" i., 13	214
" xviii., 9	198	" ii., 29	101
" xviii., 12	93	" iv., 25	115
" xxiv., 47	88	" v., 1	77, 94, 115

	Page		Page
Rom. vi., 2	104	Ephes. vi., 6	54
" vi., 11	105	Phil. i., 23	155
" vi., 1, 10	115	" iv., 22	185
" vi., 9, 10	141	Col. i., 12	149
" vi., 22	54	" i., 27	201
" vii., 3	221	" ii., 10	94
" vii., 4	3	" ii., 10-12	102
" viii., 5, 8	94	" ii., 12	93
" viii., 30	115	" ii., 20	104
" viii., 33, 34	77	" ii., 20-23	93
" x., 20, 21	221	" iii., 1	104
" xv., 22-24	214	" iii., 16	196
I Cor. i., 2	191	" iv., 3	201
" iii., 11	182	2 Thess. ii., 4	91
" v., 12, 13	89	" ii., 9	49, 184
" viii., 5	55	I Tim. i. 15	191
" ix., 5	46	" ii., 5	55
" x., 15	127	" iii., 2	46
" x., 16	134	2 Tim. ii., 25	97
" x., 16-18	124	" iii., 16, 17	85
" xi., 1	195	" iv., 10	228
" xi., 20, 21	125	Titus i., 5, 7	110
" xi., 22	134	" iii., 5	105
" xii., 27	134	" iii., 12	228
" xii., 28	116	Heb. i., 14	202
" xiii., 13	198	" ii., 15	155
" xv., 6	114	" iv., 14	21
" xv., 55	155	" v., 10	109
2 Cor. ii., 7, 8	146	" vi., 1, 2	42
" v., 1-8	155	" vi., 6	97
" v., 14	102	" vii., 2	115
" v., 19, 20	99	" viii., 5	221
" vi., 2	146	" ix., 7, 8, 24	104
" vii., 1	195	" ix., 26-28	28
" xi., 2	3	" x., 4	138
Gal. i., 18	219	" x., 12-14	28
" ii., 1, 2	219	" x., 14	156
" ii., 7, 8	187	" x., 17	77
" ii., 9	198	" xi., 7	221
" ii., 11-14	189	" xii., 23	191
" ii., 20	102	" xii., 25	221
" iii., 26	106	" xiii., 8	11
" v., 2	94	James i., 1	54
Ephes. i., 22, 23	134	" ii., 10	73, 79
" ii., 8	102	I Pet. i., 3, 23	106
" ii., 20	182	" i., 11	144
" iv., 11	116	" ii., 3-6	182
" v., 19	196	" ii., 5-9	113
" v., 26	106	" iii., 18	28
" v., 25-33	3, 167	" iv., 16	220

INDEX

295

	Page		Page
I Pet. v., 1 - - -	189	Rev. x., 17 - - -	11
2 " i., 1 - - -	54	" xii., 9 - - -	30
" i., 4 - - -	106	" xiii., 2 - - -	30
" i., 16 - - -	202	" xiii., 2, 7 - - -	184
" iii., 9 - - -	98	" xiii., 14-16 - - -	35
I John i., 9 - - -	132	" xviii., 4 - - -	35
Rev. i., 4, 8 - - -	11		

AUGUST, 1907.

A SELECTION

... FROM ...

MR. THYNNE'S LIST.

Modern Romanism Examined. A Manual of the Doctrines of Present-Day Roman Catholicism. By the Rev. H. W. DEARDEN, M.A. 430 pp., small 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. 6d. net.

Flournoy, Rev. Parke P., D.D.—The Searchlight of St. Hippolytus : The Papacy and the New Testament in the Light of Discovery. With an Introduction by Prof. W. W. MOORE, D.D. 8vo, cloth, gilt, 2s. 6d. net.

The Church of England before the Reformation. By the Rev. DYSON HAGUE, M.A. 8vo, cloth, gilt, 4s. net. With an Introductory Note by the Rt. Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Lord Bishop of Durham.

The main object of this work is to give a clear idea of the exact position of the Church of England, ecclesiastically and doctrinally, in pre-Reformation times.

The Worship of St. Philomena. A Nineteenth Century Roman Catholic Cult. By Rev. E. D. CREE, M.A., Oriel. Frontispiece, cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

Truth or Error ? or, Romish Teaching in the Light of Holy Scripture and Church History. By the Rev. JOHN R. PALMER, author of "Thoughts on our Lord's Temptation," and other Sacred Studies. Dedicated to the Rev. Chancellor J. J. Lias, M.A. Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 2s. net.

CONTENTS.—Papal Infallibility—Transubstantiation opposed to Reason, Faith, and Scripture—The Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary—Mariolatry—The Gospel and Romanism—Rome and Conciliar Freedom—England and Rome.

Life of Galeazzo Caracciolo. An illustrious Italian Protestant of the XVIth Century. Translated from the Italian of Emilio Comba. By MARIA BETTS, Translator of Desanctis's "Popery, Puseyism, and Jesuitism." Crown 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

The Two Babylons ; or, The Papal Worship Proved to be the Worship of Nimrod and his Wife. With 61 woodcut illustrations. By the late Rev. ALEX. HISLOP. 8vo, cloth, gilt, 4s. net.

The Jesuits. A Complete History of their Open and Secret Proceedings from the Foundation of the Order to the Present Time. By THEODOR GRIESINGER. Translated by A. J. SCOTT, M.D. Second Edition. 840 pp., large 8vo, 4s. net.

Lambeth and Trent. A Brief Explanation and Text-Book of the XXXIX. Articles. By the Rev. F. E. MIDDLETON, M.A. 260 pp., fcap. 8vo, cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

A Popular Manual of the Doctrines of the Church of England.

Church and Faith. Being Essays on the Teaching of the Church of England by the BISHOP OF DURHAM, Dean WACE, J. T. TOMLINSON, and other writers. With Preface by the BISHOP OF HEREFORD. Popular re-issue. 8vo, cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

Principles for Churchmen. By the late BISHOP J. C. RYLE, D.D. A Manual of Positive Statements on Some Subjects of Controversy. Fourth Edition, revised. With the Bishop's Farewell Letter to the Diocese of Liverpool. 2s. 6d. net ; with gilt edges, 3s. 6d. net.

The Book of Bertram (Monk of Corbie, A.D. 840), on the Body and Blood of the Lord. Translated from the Original Latin, with an Introduction. By the late Ven. W. F. TAYLOR, D.D., Archdeacon of Liverpool. Cloth, gilt, 1s. net.

This book has an historic interest from the fact that its perusal led both Ridley and Cranmer to reject the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Thynne's 1s. (Net) People's Series.

Size, Crown 8vo ($7\frac{1}{2} \times 5$), and bound in Cloth boards.

- (1) **Knots Untied.** Being Plain Statements on disputed points in religion. By BISHOP J. C. RYLE. Fortieth thousand.
- (2) **A Guide to the Study of the Book of Common Prayer;** or, Scripture and the Prayer Book in Harmony. By the Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, D.D., Canon of York. Dedicated by permission to the Rt. Rev. H. C. G. MOULE, D.D., Bishop of Durham.
- (3) **The Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul.** Illustrated in a course of Addresses, with a Devout Meditation added to each Chapter. By PHILIP DODDRIDGE, D.D.
- (4) **Forgotten Heroes ;** or, Faith on the Battlefield. Being the lives of some less known Continental Protestant Martyrs and Reformers. By the Rev. CHAS. J. CASHER, D.D., with a Preface by the Rev. CANON CHRISTOPHER. Second Edition.
- (5) **The 'Prentice Boys who Saved an Empire.** A Story of the Siege of Londonderry. By NATHANIEL WISEMAN.
A stirring narrative of the fall and defence of the "Maiden City."
- (6) **Gospel Foundation Truths.** Being Mission Sermons and Instructions. By the Rev. HUGH FALLOON.
- (7) **Christ our Example.** By CAROLINE FRY, Author of "The Listener," etc. With Preface by the Rev. CANON CHRISTOPHER, M.A. Twenty-seventh thousand. New Edition in larger type.

The above books can also be had in half leather bindings, with gold tops, 2s. 6d. net.

Thynne's 1s. (Net) Devotional Series.

- (1) **A Help to Family Worship**; or, Short Forms of Morning and Evening Prayer for Four Weeks. Third Series. By the Rev. F. BOURDILLON, M.A., Author of "Family Readings on the Gospels," etc. Square 8vo, large type. (In whole leather, gilt edges, 3s. net.)
- (2) **Moule—Holy Communion**; or, The Supper of the Lord. The Teaching of Holy Scripture on the Subject and the Expression of this Teaching in the Communion Service of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. S. MOULE, B.A. Cloth, lettered. (Or in whole leather, gilt edges, 3s. net.) This book contains the Communion Service.
- (3) **The Christian Communicant**; or, A Suitable Companion to the Lord's Supper. Containing Meditations on the Liturgy used by the Church of England at the celebration of that Divine Ordinance, by W. MASON. With a Preface by the Rev. W. ROMAINE. Cloth, lettered. (Or in whole leather, gilt edges, 3s. net.)
- (4) **Communion with God**; or, Morning and Evening Prayers for a Month. For private use. By M. L. M. D. Preface by the Rev. JOHN DAWSON, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Weston-super-Mare. Printed in red and black. Fourth Edition. (Leather binding, with gilt edges, 2s. net.)
- (5) **The Feast of Sacrifice and the Feast of Remembrance**; or, The Origin and Teaching of the Lord's Supper. A Companion to the Holy Communion, and containing the Order of the Administration thereof. Royal 32mo, cloth, gilt, red edges. (Whole leather, with gilt edges, 2s. net.)
- (6) **Daily Mercies**. New every Morning. By E. H. CAMERON. Short meditations offered as *seed thoughts* or suggestions for private study. Second Edition. 16mo. size, printed in red and black. Cloth, gilt, red edges. (Or in leather, with gilt edges, 2s. net.)

LONDON : CHAS. J. THYNNE.



